



## A Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

Vol. 3—No. 10

1 (217)

P. O. Box 115, San Francisco, Calif., October, 1935

Single Copies FIVE CENTS

# THE FUTURE BELONGS TO FREEDOM!

In the early part of the October Revolution most of the anarchists within or out of Russia thought that the Bolsheviks would place the aims of that Revolution—*Land and Freedom*—above those of their Marxian creed. No anarchist then or now, has, or is casting any doubt in the fidelity and sincerity of the leading spokesmen of Bolshevism—toward their Marxian ideology. But the anarchists in Russia and everywhere else have and are now more so than ever before, questioning the sincerity of the Bolsheviks, from Lenin down, toward the real aims of the October Revolution—*Land and Freedom*.

At the outset of the October Revolution Soviets symbolized the real organs of the Revolution, the threatening menace toward capitalism everywhere. With the Bolshevik's shouting lip-service to the Soviets and its aims, they succeeded in the meantime to establish themselves as the Government of Russia. Before long the voice of the Soviets diminished and the road of compromises by the Bolshevik Government began.

Lenin revealed, soon enough, that he would rather sacrifice every aim of the October Revolution, stifle every self-asserted expression of the people's ingenuity, self-initiative and spontaneous voluntary communism, than surrender one iota of the dead postulates laid down by Karl Marx or Friedrich Engels. To Lenin and the Bolsheviks the October revolution had to be bended to suit the precepts of Marxism, and since it had no "right" to come about according to Marx, it had to be moved backwards far enough so as to ultimately nullify its original aims, and turn it into a state-socialist-controlled revolution.

Under such circumstances what else could have been expected but that the anarchists, and every other sincere revolutionary grouping, should immediately begin expressing their utmost vociferous opposition to all that Lenin and his government were attempting to carry out?

Had Lenin not been the scheming marxian politician, he would have welcomed every sincere criticism, he would have aided in making the then existing Soviets a real expression of the people—where every criticism and social theory would be considered and experimented on. But instead, Lenin decreed death, jail, exile and deportation to the very elements who could and were desirous of strengthening the materialization of the aims of the October Revolution.

The compromise of the Revolution by the Bolsheviks began at Brest Litovsk and was followed up by the first open attack upon all the anarchist clubs at Moscow and various other parts of the country. The "united front" with the anarchist Makhnovtzes was turned into a wholesale jailing and massacre of the Makhnovtzes, the day following the defeat of the last counter-revolutionary attempt against Russia. The social revolutionists and other socialists fared no better. When the dissension toward the road of compromises—that the Bolsheviks were marching upon reached its own ranks, the world witnessed a second Paris Commune massacre, in the drowning in blood of the Communist soldiers and sailors rebellion of Kronstadt. Thus the reign of terror and oppression was let loose upon every dissenting voice finally reaching Leon Trotsky himself. Freedom of thought, freedom of expression and freedom of the press became but words of ridicule and derision. The *Okhrana* of Czar days was replaced by the *Tcheka* of a Marxian regime.

That such a reign of terror should breed conspiracies within its fold, imaginary as well as real ones, was but to be expected. And the world witnessed in 1930-32 wholesale trials of academicians, socialists and socialist revolutionists. Wholesale death decrees and executions followed. And still the dissension would not subside, reaching again its own ranks with the assassination of Kirov, and the subsequent execution of over one hundred "renegade" communists, and in the exile of Zinoviev, Kamenev and other lesser prominent communists.

The executions and persecutions of sincere revolutionists, or even of plotting counter-revolutionists, cannot, nor ever will they, bespeak of an honorable and just revolution. If a revolution resorts to suppressing freedom of thought, freedom of expression and freedom of the press, followed by every other sort of persecution of sincere or wilful dissenters as outlined above—it no longer can or should be considered a revolution having as its basic aim—social justice and freedom of choice in experimenting in the creation of a new society, but an actual counter-revolution against true justice and real freedom.

Whenever a revolution embarks upon employing

the same identical methods for its upkeep as those which brought it into being, it must sooner or later become just as tyrannical and oppressive as the reign which has preceded it.

An accomplished social revolution should never fear, but always welcome criticism. The sincere criticism will strengthen it, the insincere will stand self-exposed. Such a revolution cannot have any use for a single jail or court. It must disown every sort of persecution of dissenters as acts of disgrace and shame upon the revolution. It should welcome with open arms every sincere suggestion for experimentation, thereby making the most of the ingenuity and self-initiative of each and all alike. Only in this manner can the revolution become an inspiration to the very localities where it has taken place, as well as the strengthening tower and beacon light which could kindle similar social revolutions in every other part of the globe.

One need but turn to the pages of history only as far back as to the allied capitalist governments being forced to abandon their attempted intervention against the revolution in Russia, the Soviet that came into being in 1920 in Hungary and Bavaria, the seizure of the factories by the workers of Italy in the same year, the openly-expressed solidarity and readiness to defend the revolution in Russia, by the workers of England, France and even in these benighted States, as exemplified at Seattle. What else did all these events prove but a corroboration as to what has been said in regards to how far inspiring a genuine social revolution might become?

*How has it come about that all these magnificent expressions of revolutionary solidarity should have turned to nought?*

The answer is not hard to find. On one hand the absorption of the Soviets by the Bolshevik government, coupled by its deliberate policy of persecution, oppression and assassination as spoken of above. On the other hand the Bolshevik government's granting of all sorts of concessions to foreign exploiters, the signing of agreements with every sort of capitalist government, the silence of the Bolshevik government upon the mad-dog Hitler's extermination of Jews, the relationship with the Fascist butcher Mussolini, the double role of pleading for Ethiopia and at the same time selling food for Mussolini's army that is crushing Ethiopia, the joining the League of Nations—called by Lenin "a den of thieves", the knifing in the back of the seizure of the factories by the workers of Italy—declared by Lenin—as a "premature" act, the political maneuvers of the communists in Germany—claiming 400,000 followers—and allowing Hitler to ascend to power.

*What else but dissension, disillusion, indifference could or can all such policies bring about within the ranks of the thinking revolutionary world?*

Even far more harmful have all these compromising acts of the Bolsheviks in and out of Russia proven to the interests of the world-wide social revolutionary movement in many other respects. The course of compromises have given the reactionary forces of the world the very "breathing spell" which they utilized for unloosening upon the oppressed the devouring snake monsters—Fascism and Nazism, significantly enough, one lead by a leading former marxian-socialist, and the other in the name of a "national socialism."

The industrialization of the workers and peasants of Russia has not brought happiness, contentment and plentitude to a people of which 80 per cent were peasants. When 18 years after the inception of the revolution over a million peasants have to be exiled for refusing to surrender their individuality—and be labelled counter-revolutionary "Kulaks", when most of the population has to undergo privation, suffering and sacrifice because the greatest amount of the produced commodities have to be exported in order to repay for all the concessions and machinery, when over a million boys and girls, men and women have to be fed in comfort as a standing army as well as hundreds of thousands of government officials—when all this takes place amidst a country whose soil is rich enough to feed twice the inhabitants it has, then the time has come to question the entire course of mechanization and industrialization upon which over 160 million people are being forced to sacrifice themselves.

Instead of simplifying the course of the Revolution by decentralizing life so as to give it the fullest of expression and thereby bring forth the initiative of every individual, the Bolsheviks arrested and made impossible such development and growth from materializing. Thus it came about that instead of witnessing a resultant Free

Communism as the October Revolution aimed at, the worst form of centralized bureaucracy ensued.

The lesson to be derived by the oppressed in Russia and throughout the world from the eighteen years reign of a marxian-Bolshevik Government lies in this: *that no people can ever hope to emancipate themselves as long as they relinquish such a task to others, instead of relying upon themselves and their own created organs.* The oppressed everywhere can now realize that every party and government aiming to obtain control over a Revolution will ultimately prove to be the destroyers of every true and just aim of such a Revolution.

*Only a new social revolution against the most counter-revolutionary existing government of present-day ruled Russia can ever bring back again the old spirit of the October 1917 Revolution as well as fulfill its original aims—Land and Liberty.*

Freedom, being the fundamental pivot upon which social justice can rest, has received many a set back in man's struggle to attain it. It has been stabbed time and time again. Heretofore by its avowed open enemies, ever since March 1917 by its vowed lip-service, self-appointed guardians and vanguards—socialists and Bolsheviks alike. But Freedom has never been, nor ever can be vanquished forever. It will rise anew, again and again, until it will ultimately triumph over every reaction, tyranny, fascism, nazism, new-dealism, marxian-socialism and bolshevism, and by its free and open experimentation vindicate its claims to the joy and satisfaction of every true lover of liberty and justice.

*The Future Belongs To Freedom!*

MARCUS GRAHAM

## The Workers and Peasants in Russia

For over two years \* it has existed in Europe a certain press charged with the duty of glorifying the Bolshevik regime of Russia and to present it as the realization of Socialism.

Many young and enthusiastic people believe and desire to imitate the Russian example.

On the contrary here is the true situation:

In Soviet Russia the peasants are compelled to give to the state a part of their production, they are compelled to sell their harvest at a price fixed by the state and disproportionate to that of the other merchandise, and they are also forced not to keep more than what is strictly necessary for their existence. When the peasants refuse to submit themselves at once, Red soldiers are sent to take possession by force of the grain and other products.

From Moscow only during the year of 1918 were sent 30,000 soldiers with the purpose of accomplishing this work of brigandage. During the month of November 36,000 soldiers were entrusted with this work in two Provinces, (1300 of these soldiers were killed by the resisting peasants) in the Province of Klaropoff, 49 companies were scattered in the villages, but the peasants defended their products with guns and machine guns and only then did they give up after they had a real battle, Lenin and Trotsky obtained the grain spotted with the blood of its producers.

Similar facts have been verified all throughout Russia during the last two years. At the end the peasants in order not to submit any longer to this brutal requisition against which they could not resist otherwise, the peasants resolved to adopt the passive resistency and decided not to produce more than is strictly necessary to their own existence.

It is not only the peasants that the Bolshevik government has to fight in order to induce them to feed millions of functionaries and militaries through which they hold power.

The workers of the factories and laboratories are also under a regime of slavery. According to the very statements by some Bolshevik commissars: "The base of our economic activity shall be the military discipline and, in special cases, a form of dictatorial discipline." The workers did not enjoy the right to meet, to strike, any attempt of this sort being punished with armed force. It says in one degree: "The state of siege shall go into effect in all factories and the guilty ones will be punished with all severity. We cannot and our conditions of ruin and hunger, and save the republic of the Soviet, if we do not war strongly on the field of labor."

The workers know what this war means! Badly fed, they assist at the slow death of their women and children.

Deprived by the right to strike, they became slaves in the hands of the state owner that is the monopolizer of all trades. They are compelled to work where the government orders them to go. Then nothing more natural of the mass evacuation of the workers from the factories situated in the great industrial districts towards the villages from which they came and where they set to work the land and produce just the necessities to their existence, for fear of requisition.

W. TCHERKESOFF

\*This was written in 1919.

\* \* \*

*The State always has the sole purpose to limit, tame, subordinate, the individual—to make him subject to some generality or other; it lasts only so long as the individual is not all in all, and it is only the clearly marked restriction of me, my limitation, my slavery. Never does a State aim to bring in the free activity of individuals, but always that which is bound to the purpose of the State. Through the State nothing in common comes to pass either, as little as one can call a piece of cloth the common work of all the individual parts of a machine; it is rather the work of the whole machine as a unit, machine work. In the same style everything is done by the State machine too; for it moves the clockwork of the individual minds, none of which follow their own impulse. The State seeks in hinder every free activity by its censorship, its supervision, its police, and holds this hindering to be its duty of self-preservation.*

MAX STIRNER

# HOW BOLSHEVISM IN RUSSIA ROSE TO POWER \*

A year ago the "Soviet Republic" was a loose federation of workmen, soldiers and peasants. It was governed by no man and was repugnant at State, Socialists and bourgeois alike.

Today the Soviets are submerged in a semi-social democratic state with which any capitalistic government can easily make treaties. Bolsheviks can't afford to say that the old type of Soviets exists no longer in Russia, but I, not being a Bolshevik, can. The Bolsheviks did not create the early anarchistic condition of Russia, but on the contrary, they have created the only real government by which it could have been done.

In the Czar's Russia, everybody of enlightenment considered himself a revolutionist, and when the crash came in March, 1917, everyone thought it was his kind of revolution. But 180,000,000 men bursting chains make a force before which all theories have to break or bend. Miliukoff's, Teretschenko's and Kerensky's theories broke. The subtle analyst Lenin's theories bent before the blind giant force, and carefully fitted themselves around it.

Despite the childish habit that we all have of thinking that each event of history is due to the particular act of some individual, I shall have to ask the reader to believe that Lenin did not make the October revolution. The whole substance of that revolution was roughly mapped out in advance in the minds of dumb millions.

I was in San Francisco in the summer of 1917, when immigrants returning to Russia poured through that city.

Being intensely interested in the social phenomenon of the Russian revolution, I asked many of these travellers who and what Lenin and the Bolsheviks were. None of them knew. But no less than a dozen obscure workmen told me that the workers and peasants were forcibly to stop the war, overthrow Kerensky, and seize the land industries, which they would run by Soviets such as had cropped up in the 1905 revolution, and of which they had a miniature imitation then in San Francisco for handling their business of travel.

No, Lenin did not make the October revolution.

By July, 1917, the peasants had covered the valley of the Volga and Central Russia with a network of land committees, and the annihilation of the landlords and the lawless taking of the land had gotten under way. None of these peasants knew at that time what a Bolshevik was. A month before the October revolution a wave of chateau-burning and landlord-killing swept those parts of Russia where Bolsheviks were least known.

As soon as the Czar's policemen were safely jailed or shot, the Petrograd workmen broke up the old government-fostered craft unions, formed industrial unions with shop steward committees, demanded wages that amounted to confiscation of the factories, and elected Soviets for the express purpose of dictating to the government. These city workmen determined their own wages, dictated management of the business, and by force prevented the closing of the factories and removal of raw materials—but all the while they had a holy horror of "Bolshevism."

It wasn't Lenin; it was a lack of policemen.

Government machinery had no connection whatever with the social body.

There were many political experts trying to analyze the situation, and the most successful analyst was Lenin. He knew that the State was dead and that there was nothing in Russia that could be made into another state but this giant force of Soviets, if it could be bent under authority. He set about to do it. There was only one way to get control of the giant. It was a way at which we may turn up our noses, but I think it is the only way in which political power was ever won—to say the things that your crowd want to hear.

Lenin knew what the active masses wanted before the masses knew it themselves.

General Korniloff speeded the oncoming storm more than Lenin did. His uprising simply lay bare the powder magazine under Kerensky's feet, and gave the match to Lenin; it showed that nearly everything capable of fighting was willing to fight for the most radical phase of the revolution. When Korniloff and Kerensky awoke from their dream, they found every workingman in Petrograd armed and in an ugly mood. From that time on there was nothing more to be done than to let the workmen and sailors throw themselves on the shell of a government and crush it in. A little practical organizing by the Bolsheviks, and the thing was done.

In the first months after the revolution which they had led, the Bolsheviks chiefs did not rule Russia, for no man can rule Soviets of the kind that then existed. The workmen had taken the factories, and the peasants the land at a time the Bolsheviks could not have prevented it had they tried. The Bolsheviks passed laws legalizing what the workmen and peasants had already done. That was the only way they had of making their power real. Gradually some of the workmen and peasants began to regard these laws as the sources of their gains. They were lawless, but if the law brought them what they wanted—well, they were won back to law.

The spirit of lawless but fullhearted communism into which all Russia was plunged for several months is inescapable. The military forces were a series of armed groups voluntarily co-operating throughout European and Asiatic Russia in harmony due to their common aims, but taking orders from no men. Regiments elected their own officers, marched where they pleased, fought as they pleased—, many of them under the black flag

\* Robert Minor wrote in 1919 a series of articles on his observations in Russia in the New York *World*, as well as in the local *Daily Bulletin* of Butte, Montana. These two articles are taken from the last named newspaper. Minor has subsequently recanted, and since 1920 has been one of the leading editors of the communist press of this country. The truth, as he has penned it in 1919, remains the nevertheless the truth.—M. G.

of anarchy—and supported the nominal government from week to week only as a committee that suited them. When orders came from Moscow, regiments decided by vote whether to obey or not, and any dissatisfied minority would secede and pursue its own campaigns.

That was the thing that Lenin had found growing out of the wild, dreary soul of Russia, and which by circumstances was tagged with his little political party's name, "Bolshevism."

It might be said that Lenin was for a time swayed from his orthodox Socialism by the thundering charm of the thing. The tremendousness and romance of it,

## Eighteen Years After

The material presented in this issue deals mostly with the aims of the October Revolution in Russia. The thoughts gathered represent the opinions of anarchists from various parts of the world. Those of Peter Kropotkin, Alexander Berkman, and Hippolyte Havel have already appeared at one time or another in the English language. So has also that of Robert Minor. In bringing together once again these opinions, with those appearing in this issue for the first time in the English language, it is hoped, that a clear picture will be obtained as to what have been the real objects of the October Revolution, what has become of these objects, as also the role of the anarchists in the October Revolution, and since. The revelations made by Robert Minor in 1919, still hold forth their importance, this, in spite of his having become one of the chief spokesmen of Leninism in America. Peter Kropotkin's view as to what has happened to the Russian revolution at the hands of the Bolsheviks, and what course there remains for anarchists to pursue, his appeal to Lenin not to destroy the initiative of the people and protesting against the persecution and oppression of political opponents and of their relatives—all this can and should be more appreciated today by every sincere revolutionist than even at the time when it was written. The trenchant balance sheet drawn by Alexander Berkman as to what the Bolsheviks have done to the October Revolution assumes likewise even more significance today—seven years after its original appearance. Those who seek to learn the fundamental differences that separate the anarchists from the Bolsheviks and socialists of all schools will find clear cut answers in the thoughts of Errico Malatesta, William C. Owen, E. Armand and Hippolyte Havel.

Amidst a governmental world-ridden wave of intolerance and hatred brought on by bolshevism and fascism upon the ruins of an hypocritical vain democracy and bankrupt capitalist order, increasing more and more the powers of the State, the anarchist voice appears very negligible. On one hand every government, including that of the Bolsheviks, suppress and oppress the anarchist voice, and on the other hand the socialists and communists alike, repeatedly declare the anarchist movement as dead. The anarchist ideal, based upon the highest conception of voluntary cooperation and freedom in the relationship between man and fellow-man, can no more be destroyed by the persecutions and oppressions of governments and the announcing of its demise by socialists and communists than Truth could ever be destroyed by Lies. An ideal based on such just and truthful deductions and conclusions that every socialist school must admit it as the ultimate achievement of a genuine perfect society can never be destroyed by any force or misrepresentation.

Eighteen years after the greatest social attempt in our modern history that uprooted the most ugly form of present capitalism—Czarism, the position of the anarchists toward and in the Revolution of Russia stands fully vindicated, whereas that of every other marxian party stands bankrupt or indicted as the betrayer of the true aims of the October revolution. The material appearing in this issue fully attests to this. Only the blind and intolerant may choose to ignore or malign the anarchist position. Those who can reason and are not afraid of the truth can draw their own conclusions.

MANI

flowing as it did in crude form from the lips and arms of millions of peasants and workmen who had been peasants, seemed for a brief while to make Lenin sweep aside the dusty volumes of Marx and to join in the song. Perhaps, though, it was only "real-politic." I am sure Lenin would deny ever having been unorthodox. Very soon he began to weld this raw material into something vastly different. The anarchistic song still faintly echoes down the Volga and the Don and the Dnieper, and in the Moscow and Petrograd workshops, and a note or two of it may still creep into Lenin's State affairs; but he very soon began suppressing the anarchy and building a police force.

At Brest-Litovsk the departure began. Then and there the Bolsheviks had to decide whether the revolution was simply a fiery to pour over Europe in uncompromised purity at any cost, or whether the revolution's value lay in crystallizing a State.

But the Bolsheviks wanted to build a SOCIALIST STATE at any cost. In November, December, and in January they quietly pleaded with the Allied embassies for 300 or 400 officers to help them organize a military defence, while in public they denounced "all imperialistic governments" alike in the hope of arousing the German working class by their attitude. The French Government assigned three officers about March 25th and the British Government appointed Colonel Boyle whom Trotzky im-

mediately made dictator of railroads, though Colonel Boyle left in three days. A few American officers appeared and were put to work drilling the Red Guard. The American Ambassador was understood to promise 350 engineers, but they did not come. Paris and Washington had been misled to believe that the Bolsheviks were German spies. On February 28th the Bolsheviks made their last appeal to the Allied Governments.

Then they signed peace at Brest-Litovsk. They came back to Moscow to get the treaty ratified. Karl Radek (who is by feverish imaginations classed as a German spy,—and is now in a German gaol)—bitterly denounced the surrender to the German Imperialists and declared that the revolution would stand before Europe in moral bankruptcy if the treaty were ratified. Ryazanoff, president of the All-Russian Industrial Unions, demanded that the revolution should die with honor rather than live in shame. Lenin, with state-building in his head, in his heart and in his hand, was almost the only man in the Soviet Central Committee who dared to raise his voice for ratification. "We are no children," he said. "Let us look facts in the face; do not become the victims of a phrase."

Lenine had his way, and the revolution cast off from anarchy and started on its State career.

As nobody can build a state on the foundation of an officer-defying, ambassador-killing volatile minority, the Bolsheviks had to shift their governing structure more completely on to the steadier support of the inactive majority—in other words, to establish what practically amounts to "democracy."

They felt that they had to do the industrial unions what they had done to the army—bring them under the central political authority. Anarchistic syndicalism was practically controlling all the industries of Russia. Political power cannot exist and tolerate an independent economic power. Syndicalism was to give way to government ownership, political control.

It was hard to make the industrial workers submit to it. Throughout the summer, while Trotzky wrestled over the Russian prairies with the independent regiments to make them accept him as war minister instead of an adviser, Lenin wrestled in the towns to down his syndicalists.

A "Council of Public Economy," consisting of political and technical specialists, was first appointed by the government to overlook and advise the industrial unions in their production.

There was no objection as long as the council had nothing but advisory power, and the syndicalists worked with it harmoniously. Little by little the skilled hand of Lenin began to weld into the council of public economy an absolute authority over all productions and all matters pertaining to the factories, mines and railroads.

To disentangle the government from syndicalism, it was arranged for the industrial unionists to have two separate ways of voting.

Each has one vote for a political delegate and another vote for his factory council, which no longer has any political power.

In the political field the worker has become a voter by occupational division instead of by geographical district as in England and America. In the industrial field the worker is a member of an industrial union in a government-owned plant, the government controlling everything, except some internal shop labor matters.

Lenine succeeded in this tremendous change, ditching syndicalism and substituting conventional government ownership, only by telling the industrial unions that it was a temporary measure, due to military necessity, and that later the political authority would fall away again and leave the purely industrial organization. But I don't think it ever will unless many years from now by another violent revolution against the most revolutionary-proof government in the world.

The ideal of the original Simon pure Soviet system was that:

The constitution of future society shall be defined, not upon geographical lines, but the lines of industrial unionism.

Without central (enforced) authority that would come pretty close to anarchist syndicalism. With central (enforced) authority it would amount to the programme of the American Socialist Labor Party as set forth by Daniel De Leon. But after going through the anarchist phase, which the Bolsheviks could not prevent, and then through the De Leon phase, which Lenine calls his ideal, the Russian Soviet republic is now being tempered by arrangements to let in foreign capital.

It is important to trace the way in which the Bolshevik government eradicated anarchist syndicalism, because that government is at present planning great industrial concession to entente bondholders and American capital. As things are now, these operations would not be embarrassed by lawless syndicalism. Capital has before learned the value of dealing with the centre in labor matters, and the present Russian government is the most successful labor centre in the world.

ROBERT MINOR

The commercial relations are carried over the heads of the Russians as well as the foreign organized workers. It finds its expression, also, in a whole series of measures restricting the self-activity of the masses and giving the initiative to the scions of the capitalist world . . . We are the toiling people, and they are the Soviet officials, on whom everything depends. This is the whole trouble . . . There can be no self-activity without freedom of thought and opinion . . . We are afraid of mass-activity . . . We are afraid of criticism, we have ceased to rely on the masses hence, we have bureaucracy with us.

A. KOLONTAY, Moscow, 1923

\* Madame A. Kolontay has, since having written the above, recanted, and is again a leading official of the Bolshevik government.—M. G.

# THE AIMS OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Alexander Berkman

What were the objects of the Russian Revolution? What have the Bolsheviks achieved?

The Romanov regime was an absolutism; Russia under the Tsars was the most enslaved country in Europe. The people hungered for liberty. The February-March Revolution, 1917, abolished that absolutism. The people became free.

But that freedom was only negative. The people were free from the chains that had held them bound for centuries. Now their liberated arms and spirit longed to apply themselves, sought the opportunity to do, to act. But that freedom had not yet been achieved. The people were free from some things, but not to do the things they wanted. They wanted positive freedom. The workers wanted the opportunity to use the tools and machinery they had themselves made; they wanted to use them to create more wealth and to enjoy that wealth. The peasant wanted free access to the land and a chance to cultivate it without being robbed by the government of the products of his hard toil. The people at large wanted to apply their new-won freedom to the pursuit of life and happiness.

The negative liberty of the February-March Revolution was therefore quite unsatisfactory, unconvincing and insufficient. That is why the people soon began to continue the revolution, to deepen it into a social transformation. To make the social revolution, in short. The soldiers dropped their guns and left the front en masse. They knew they had nothing to fight for in foreign countries. They returned to their fathers and brothers, the peasants, and together they drove the landlords away, and went to work on their own motherland. The industrial proletariat at the same time expropriated the lords of industry and possessed themselves of the mills, mines and factories. Thus the laboring masses of Russia came into their own, for the first time in the history of the world.

As always during revolution, this activity of the Russian masses proceeded outside the sphere of governmental influence. The struggle against oppression—whether political, economic or social—against the exploitation of man by man, is always at the same time also a struggle against government itself, against government as such.

The Russian Revolution, like every revolution, faced this alternative; to build freely, independently of government and even despite it; or to choose government with all the limitation and stagnation that it involves. The path of the Russian Revolution lay in the constructive self-reliance of the masses, in the direction of no-government, of Anarchism.

Between February and October, 1927, the Revolution instinctively followed that path. It destroyed the old State mechanism and proclaimed the principle of the federation of Soviets. It used the method of direct expropriation to abolish private capitalistic ownership. In the field of economic reconstruction it applied the principle of the federation of shop and factory committees for the management of production. Proletarian and peasant organizations attended to distribution and exchange. House committees looked after the proper assignment of living quarters. Street and district committees secured public safety.

This was the path of the October-November Revolution. In that spirit it kept growing and developing. But this development of the Revolution was not in consonance with the philosophy of Marx and the purpose of the Communist Party. The latter sought to gain control of the movement of the masses, and gradually succeeding, it gave an entirely different turn to the work of social reconstruction. Under cover of the motto, "the dictatorship of the proletariat" it began to build a centralized, bureaucratic State. In the name of the "defense of the Revolution" it abolished popular liberties and instituted a system of new oppression and terror.

The Bolshevik idea was, in effect, that the Social Revolution must be directed by a special staff, vested with dictatorial powers. The fundamental characteristic of that idea was a deep distrust of the masses. According to the Bolsheviks, the masses must be made free by force. "Proletarian compulsion in all its forms," wrote Bukharin, the foremost Communist theoretician, "beginning with summary execution and ending with compulsory labor, is a method of reworking the human material of the capitalistic epoch into Communist humanity."

The Communist Party proceeded "reworking" the human material. Compulsion and terrorism became the main means toward it. Freedom of thought, of the press, of public assembly, self-determination of the worker and of his unions, the initiative and freedom of labor—all this was declared old rubbish, "bourgeois prejudices." The "dictatorship of the proletariat" became the absolutism of a handful of Bolsheviks in the Kremlin.

Practically the Communist dictatorship worked out as follows; free exchange of opinion was suppressed; the initiative of the individual as well as of the collectivity, so vital in life, and particularly in revolutionary times, was eliminated; voluntary co-operation and organized free efforts were wiped out; every revolutionary element, not Bolshevik, was exterminated or imprisoned. The people's Soviets were transformed into sections of the ruling political party; the labor organizations found themselves deprived of all power and activity, serving only as the official mouthpiece of the Party orders. Each and every citizen became the servant of the Bolshevik State, its obedient functionary, unquestioningly executing the will of his master, the all-powerful Kremlin dictators.

The inevitable results did not fail soon to manifest themselves. The Bolshevik policies corrupted and disintegrated the Revolution, slayed its soul and destroyed

its moral and spiritual significance. By its bloody despotism, by its tyrannous paternalism, both petty and stupid, by its deadening formalism and criminal indifference to the interests and aspirations of the laboring masses, by its cowardly suspicion and distrust of the people and by its mania of persecution, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" hopelessly cut itself off from the laboring masses.

Thrust back from direct participation in the constructive work of the Revolution, harassed at every step, the victim of constant control and supervision by the Party, the proletariat got to feel that the Revolution and its further fortunes were the private, personal affair of the Bolsheviks. Constructive energy and active interest on the part of the people were paralyzed. Resentment and hatred took their place. The factories were deserted, the peasant refused to feed his new oppressors.

Lenin was compelled to introduce the "new economic policy." It meant the return of capitalism, "for long and in earnest," as Lenin himself had put it. The return of capitalism, in 1921, which the social revolutionary work of the laboring masses of Russia had abolished in 1917! The return of capitalism, as the direct result of Bolshevik methods; of capitalism partly State and partly private.

And today, after . . . years of Bolshevik rule? Growing and inevitable disintegration of the Party itself, with the threat of a Napoleonic shadow in the background. While the country is groaning under the heel of a Tsarist Socialism.

Social antagonisms, the exploitation of labor, the enslavement of the worker and peasant, the cancellation of the citizen as a free human being and his transfor-

mation into a microscopic part of the economic mechanism owned by the Government; the creation of privileged groups favored by the State; a multitudinous and corrupt bureaucracy; a system of labor service with its degrading and brutalizing rewards and punishments—these are the characteristic features of Russia of today.

Only blind fanaticism or unpardonable hypocrisy can see in this, the most grievous form of slavery, the emancipation of labor or even the least approach to it.

The so-called "proletarian dictatorship" in Russia today is the worst betrayal of all that the Russian Revolution stood for. It is black reaction and counter-revolution.

There is no hope for Russia except in the return to the principles and purposes of October. The first step toward it is the termination of the dictatorship, the re-establishment of real, free Soviets, of freedom of speech, press and assembly, the absolute abolition of persecution for opinion's sake, and the immediate and unconditional liberation of all labor and political prisoners.

\* \* \*

First of all we observe a merging of State and Party in Russia, similar to the merging of State and Church in the Middle Ages. This merging created a monstrous State which is the Party, and a Party which is the State—with a monstrous centralization and a regimentation—all dependent upon centralization; the planting of potatoes, the manufacture of shoe-polish, and . . . human life . . . Any dictatorship, no matter what its purpose, regardless of its aims, is despotism, and no freedom is compatible with despotism . . . The fact that the bureaucracy is composed of peasants and the intelligentsia does not change the essence of the dictatorship, nor its harmfulness . . . Arbitrariness, shooting, murders, prison, exile, moral and at times physical torture, are the natural consequences of such a regime.

G. MAXIMOV

## Socialism and the State

I believe this is our opportunity of getting before the international public and getting that immensely increased co-operation to which our principles are entitled. But we shall not get that following unless we state those principles quite boldly, and so plainly that a child can understand them. I think the day for all this super-learned propaganda, with its elaborate theorizing and its eternal references—a la Lenin—to supposed "authorities" who wrote fifty and a hundred years ago, is past. The matter is simple and must be put simply.

It is useless for the helpless to yell for liberty. They must first get out of their helplessness and win, each one of them, independence. This can be done only by becoming individually masters of the means of life, and it cannot possibly be done by submission to any dictatorship, whether that dictatorship be one of a minority or majority, political or what not.

The very essence of all Socialism, no matter what its brand, is subjection to the governing machine. With that we cannot compromise, and we should make the split openly and bravely. We should point out that Socialism has been failing all along the line; that it made its most conspicuous failure precisely where it was strongest and at the most critical of all conceivable moments, viz. in Germany, at the outbreak of the war. We should point out further, clearly but quite mercilessly, that it has touched the lowest depths of degradation in its almost universal endorsement of Bolshevism, which is State Socialism in its crudest, most dictatorial and most stupid form.

Socialism is a stupid creed, because it ignores the individual, who is the representative of Life itself and, therefore, cannot be ignored. It is stupid also because it relies entirely on compulsion, and the more highly developed the individual becomes the more bitterly, and the more effectively, he rebels against compulsion. Socialism, therefore, by the very nature of things, is doomed to everlasting defeat.

I have watched the Socialist movement attentively, and been in constant touch with it, for some forty years. My very decided judgment is that it is far weaker, for more split up, far more a mere weak, compromising, opportunist movement today than it ever was. It has fought whatever fight was ever in it, and is now ready for the knock-out blow. What has become a mere wind-bag should be punctured.

Lenin has had, at least, the sense to recognize the movement's weakness, and has tried to remedy it by the only means he, as a Socialist, could think of, compulsion. In his own country, of which he has made himself dictator, he has shot and imprisoned and persecuted ruthlessly, in the vain effort to crush individual freedom and enforce unity. Despite the invaluable assistance lent him by the Allies, whose idiotic assaults rallied all Russia to him, he has failed most ignominiously. The entire economic life of Russia is threatening to expire, and his only hope of retaining power is more terrorism, more militarism, a continually expanding programme of invasion. East for choice, because there the forces of defense are weaker—camouflaged under the pretext of a world-wide war on capitalism. This extension of militarism will not kill capitalism. On the contrary, it will give it a fresh lease of life. If we could get rid of militarism—the armed man holding the unarmed in subjection—the present system would collapse instantly.

I am well aware that there is another side to all this, and that many say, with much show of reason, that capitalism has to be attacked, and Bolshevism, attacking it fiercely, should be supported. I agree that it should be attacked—surely we ourselves are doing that incessantly and to the limit of our powers. But capitalism dominates owing to the helplessness of the poor, and their helpless poverty is due to monopoly, and it is es-

sentially the business of Government—especially in its most extreme form, that of dictatorship—to uphold the monopoly of power. The politician and the soldier are Siamese twins, birds of a feather, for they both exist to enforce—the one by legislation and taxation, the other by the gun—the rule of the few over the many. And, as like seeks like, I am quite sure that the British Government will come to terms with the Lenin Government the moment it becomes convinced that he also has succeeded in forming a strong and, above all, a militarist Government.\* That has always been British policy, as indeed it is the policy of all Governments. "Get power; honestly if you can; but get it. Then we can do business with you."

I am one of those who think that if we could eliminate militarism, monopoly—on which capitalism rests—would fall to pieces, for it is entirely out of date and is becoming generally recognised as such. If it could be deprived of its military backing the workers would make short work of it. I certainly want, therefore, to disarm it, and it seems to me that the only hope of doing this lies in popularising the thought that we don't want this ownership of the many by the few; don't want the masses held up everlasting at the pistol's muzzle; don't want these drones cornering the honey because they have the guns.

In a word, I think the compulsion regime, though it seems at present to have all the cards in its hands, is really played out already; for it has reduced the entire world to intolerable misery, and that must mean, sooner or later, universal revolt. The revolt is being hindered by the fact that the Socialists everywhere preach and practice compulsion. For that reason I hate them, and I think the business of all those who love freedom and detest slavery is to go for them without gloves.

We have a long road to hoe, and we shan't hoe it by indulging in hysteria. We have to put our backs and our intelligence into it; mastering our subject so that we can present it clearly and forcibly. If we do that we shall succeed, for the times are very ripe for exactly the propaganda we have to urge. First, no compromise with Socialism, which is the philosophy of compulsion by those in power; and I think we should always point out that Socialism never intended to abolish wage slavery, but only to intensify it by making us all wage slaves to the governing machine.

WILLIAM C. OWEN

\* Our late Comrade William C. Owen has written the above before relationships between Great Britain and Russia came about. The views expressed are from one of the many treasured, and hitherto unpublished, letters that he has written to me.—M. G.

## REFORM AND REVOLUTION

The historical meaning of the word revolution is radical reform of institutions, rapidly attained by means of violent insurrection of the people against the established government and privileges and we are revolutionists and insurrectionists not because we want to improve the present institution but because we want to destroy them completely, abolishing the rule of man over man and all parasites of human labor; because we want to do this as soon as possible and because we are convinced that institutions which are born from violence, are sustained by violence and will yield only to sufficient violence.

Today we are reformers as far as we try to make the conditions more favorable and the personnel more conscientious and more numerous to bring about a successful insurrection of the people; to-morrow, when the insurrection has triumphed and liberty has been conquered, we will be reformers in as much as we will try with all the means available through liberty, that is, with propaganda, with examples, even with violent resistance against anyone who would try to restrict our liberty, we will try, I say, to win over to our side of the ideas the greatest number of people as possible.

But we will never recognize—and in this our reformation distinguishes itself from a certain revolutionism that amuck in Mussolini's or the ballot-box of others—we will never recognize institution, we will take or conquer such reforms as are possible in the same spirit with which one takes from the enemy inch upon inch of its territory in order to proceed still further and we will always remain enemies of any kind of government, be it the monarchy of today or the republican or bolshevik government of to-morrow.

ERRICO MALATESTA

# WE MUST WEATHER THE TYPHOON \*

Peter Kropotkin

A stormy talk with S. and S. Always the same eternal reproaches—why don't I come out with a definite programme—of what? Action? No "views"—a general opinion of current events. Here is my opinion.

The revolution we have gone through is the sum total not of the efforts of separate individuals, but a natural phenomenon, independent of the human will, a natural phenomenon similar to a typhoon such as rises suddenly on the coasts of Eastern Asia.

Thousands of causes, in which the work of separate individuals and even of parties has been only a grain of sand, one of the minute local whirlwinds, have contributed to form the great natural phenomenon, the great catastrophe which shall either renew, or destroy; or perhaps both destroy and renew.

All of us, and I in that number, prepared this great inevitable change. But it was also prepared by all the previous revolutions of 1793, 1848-1871; by all the writings of the Jacobins, socialists, politicians; by all the achievements of science; industry, art and so on. In a word, millions of natural causes, have contributed just in the same way as millions of movements of particles of air or water cause the sudden storm which sinks hundreds of ships or destroys thousands of houses—as the trembling of the earth in an earthquake is caused by thousands of small tremors and by the preparatory movements of separate particles. In general, people do not see events concretely, solidly; they think more in words than in clearly imagined pictures, and they have absolutely no idea what a revolution is—of those many millions of causes which have gone to give it its present form, and they are therefore inclined to exaggerate the importance in the progress of the revolution of their personality and of that attitude which they, or their friends and co-thinkers will take up in this enormous upheaval. And of course they are absolutely incapable of understanding how powerless is any individual, whatever his intelligence and experience, in this whirlpool of hundreds of thousands of forces which have been put into motion by the upheaval.

They do not understand that once such a great natural phenomenon has begun, such as an earthquake, or rather such as a typhoon, separate individuals are powerless to exercise any kind of influence on the course of events. A party can perhaps do something, far less than is usually thought, but still at least on the surface of the oncoming waves, its influence may perhaps be very slightly noticeable. But separate small aggregations not forming a fairly large mass, are undoubtedly powerless—their powers are certainly nil.

Imagine to yourself a wave, a sazhen (a Russian land measurement) high, which has rushed unto the shore, and imagine a man trying to oppose this wave with his stick—or even with his boat! Your strength is no greater than this—there is nothing left to do but to weather the typhoon.

It is in this position that I, an Anarchist, find myself. But even much more numerous parties in Russia at the present moment are in a very similar position.

I will even go farther: the governing party itself is in the same position. It no longer governs, it is being carried along by the current which it helped to create but which is now already a thousand times stronger than the party itself.

There was a dam, holding back a mass of water. We all worked to undermine this dam. And I did my share in this work.

Some dreamed of guiding the water into a narrow channel to work their own mill. Others hoped to make a new bed with the help of the flood, from the river. Now the river is rushing forward not towards the mill, which it has already destroyed, and not towards the bed we had marked out for it, because the flood has come not as the result of our efforts, but as the result of a mass of far greater reasons which have enabled the river to break through the dam.

And now the question is: what is to be done? To mend the dam? Absurd.

Too late.

To dig a new channel for the flood—impossible. We prepared a channel for the river, one which we thought the best. But it turned out to be too shallow and insufficiently prepared. When the flood came, the water did not flow into it. It is rushing on breaking everything along another way.

What is there to be done?

We are experiencing a revolution which has advanced not at all along those ways which we had prepared for it, but which we had no time to prepare sufficiently—what is to be done now?

To prevent the revolution? Absurd!

Too late. The revolution will advance in its own way, in the direction of the least resistance, without paying the least attention to our efforts.

At the present moment the Russian revolution is in the following position. It is perpetrating horrors. It is ruining the whole country. In its mad fury it is annihilating human lives, that is why it is a revolution and not peaceful progress, because it is destroying without looking what it destroys and whether it goes.

And we are powerless, for the present, to direct it into another channel, until such time as it will have

played itself out. It must wear itself out.

And then?

Then—inevitably will come a reaction. Such is the law of history, and it is easy to understand why this cannot be otherwise.

People imagine that we can change the form of development of a revolution—that is a childish illusion. A revolution is such a force that its growth cannot be changed.

And a reaction is absolutely inevitable, just as a hollow in the water is inevitable after every wave, as weakness is inevitable in a human being after a period of feverish activity.

Therefore the only thing we can do is to use our energy to lessen the fury and force of the oncoming reaction.

But of what can our efforts consist?

To modify the passions—on one as on the other side? Who is likely to listen to us? Even if there exist such diplomats who can do anything in this role, the time for their debut has not yet come; neither the one nor the other side is as yet disposed to listen to them. I see one thing: we must gather together people who will be capable of undertaking constructive work, in each and every party after the revolution has worn itself out. We Anarchists must gather together a group of honest, devoted, not-eaten-up-by-self-esteem, anarchist-workers. And if I was younger and could see hundreds of people, of course in such a way as this should be done, if you want to collect people for work in common—

If such gatherers of Anarchists are to be found amongst our Comrades, I am of course ready to help them. Then of course we must write, but far more is to be done by letters and personal contact than through the press . . .

## Kropotkin's Two Letters To Lenin

Living in the center of Moscow, you are unable to know the present state of things in the country. One must live on the land and be in close touch with the daily life, its needs and calamities; one must be with those who starve—adults and children—one must see the endless applications in various offices . . . to be allowed to buy . . . a miserable oil-lamp, etc . . . to know the truth about the actual sufferings. And, there is only one conclusion. The step to more normal conditions must be hastened. Things cannot go on much longer in this way; they lead to a bloody catastrophe. Neither allies' locomotives, nor the exportation of wealth, cotton, flax, leather and other things which we ourselves need very badly, could bring help to the Russians. One thing is sure, even if the dictatorship of a party were a useful means to bring a blow to the capitalistic system (I doubt it very much) it is absolutely harmful for the building of a new Socialist Order. It is perceptibly necessary that the constructive work be done by the local forces, and this is not the case, anywhere. Instead of that, we see, at every step, people who have never known real life, make the greatest blunders; blunders which cost the lives of thousand of persons and ruin entire regions. Take the stock-work of burning-wood . . . Or at the last spring, of seeds . . .

Without participation of the local forces, without constructive work from bottom to top, accomplished by workers and peasants themselves, the building of a new life is impossible.

It would seem that such construction coming from below, ought to be the work of the soviets. But Russia is no longer a sovietic Republic, except in name. The influence and power of the party-men, often new comers to communism, (men devoted to ideas,

generally remain in the ranks) have already annihilated the constructive influence and strength of this institution which promised so much—the Soviets. They are no longer Soviets, they are party Committees who govern Russia. And their constructive work suffers all the official blunders.

To get out of the actual disorder, Russia must appeal to the local forces' creative mind, which, I see, are able to become a factor in the creation of a new life. And the quicker this will be understood, the better it will be, then, be more inclined to give shape to the social life. But if the present situation lasts, even the very word "socialism" will become a curse, as it happened in France with the idea of equality during forty years after the Jacobin go-

vernment.

In all comradeship.

P. KROPOTKIN.

Izvestia and Pravda publish a declaration making known that the Soviet Government has decided to take as hostage, revolutionary socialists from the group Savinkov and Tchernov, Whites from the "National Center" and "Tactic Center" and some Wrangel officers; that in case of attempt against a Soviet chief, it has been decided to "exterminate without pity" these hostages.

Is it possible that there was no one person among you to call the attention of those comrades, to persuade them that such measures constitute a return to the worst epoch of the middle ages, to the religious wars, that they are unworthy of men who have society based on communism? That such measures cannot be taken by those who have the future of communism at heart.

Is it possible that no one took the trouble to explain the meaning of hostage?

A hostage is placed in prison, but not as a penalty for a crime. They keep him to threaten opponents with his death. If you kill one of us, we shall kill yours! Is it not the same thing as to take the convicted to the place of execution every morning and taking him back to his cell tell him, "Wait . . . not today . . ."

Is it possible that your comrades do not understand that this is the equivalent to the re-establishment of torture—for hostages and families?

I hope that no one will tell me that life for those who are in power is not always merry . . .

At present, even among kings, there are some who consider an attendant on their life as a "particularity of the trade."

Yet, the revolutionists themselves, before courts,—so acted Louise Michel—they refuse to charge the defense of those who have tried to kill them as did Malatesta and Voltairine de Cleyre. Even kings and priests have waived means of defense as barbarous as the taking of hostages.

How can propagandists of a new life, sponsors of a new social order use such means of defense?

With all its great defects—and you know that I see them—the October revolution has made an enormous step. It has shown that the social revolution is not impossible as they started to believe in Occidental Europe. In spite of all its defects, it causes a movement towards equality which all attempts to a backward step will never be able to destroy.

Why then drive the revolution in a way that leads to its downfall, especially by defects which are not at all socialistic or communistic, but survivals of the old social order and of the old crimes of an unlimited power that absorbs everything.

P. KROPOTKIN.

\* \* \*

It is really terrible to see how poor has been the contribution of "marxism" to the socialist progress and how it has effected against progressive attempts . . . Marx and Engels have expedited the first socialists and most of the socialists of their times in the fanatical parts of "utopists"; it was a question of life to them to destroy all the free conceptions of socialism. Of Max Stirner and Proudhon till Bakunin and Dühring; they have pushed aside ethic, free-thought, federalism, everything, and served only the fetich—political economy. They have fought autonomy, initiative, and discredited, carried on the organizations of a privileged circle.

At the same time the first socialists were ready and willing to utilize every opportunity to come in contact with the world . . . Robert Owen, Saint Simon, Fourier . . . Bokunine, Elisee Reclus and all others.

MAX NETTLAU

## The Fallacy of Leadership

The most tragic mistake of the downtrodden and lowly has so far been the belief in leadership. Only recently the workers began to realize how fallacious this belief has been.

If the present leadership in Soviet Russia seems to those who believe in the greatness of Russia's social revolution a contradiction of the foregoing statement, the answer is not far to seek. The present leadership in Russia is great by the very reason of its emphasis on the mass, and its sense of utter dependence for any final success upon the mass. Either the leadership of the Marxists in Russia will more and more merge itself into mass development, mass self-expression, or else it will become a menace and an obstacle to revolutionary progress.\*

The only leadership that can justify itself is the leadership which does not seek to lead the masses, but rather to coincide with the movement of life and interpret life; which in other words identifies itself utterly in its deepest consciousness with the deep stream of revolution and seeks more and more self-abnegating unity with the actual common experience of the workers.

The whole hero-worship cult, however diffused our heroism may be over considerable groups of men and women, is fundamentally an impeachment of the human race as a whole. It is the "all we-like-sheep" interpretation of life, which, however much it seems to have in its favor, is not true to the profoundest study of history and the interpretation of economics. And the emphasis of the "herd instinct," paradoxical as it may seem, is not a reaffirmation of the pious pessimism of ages, but is rather a scientific demonstration of the highest worth both to the spirit of an intelligent and impregnated optimism, and to a faith in a eventually efficient organization of society.

To believe that the few are more powerful than the many is not so much an appreciation of the few as it is a disparagement of the many. And to insist that a single faculty of man, the reasoning faculty, is of more consequence to the evolutionary process than the sum total of forces which compose his vitality is not to exalt reason so much as it is to discredit life itself.

\* Comrade Havel, as many other Anarchists, had hoped for the best. But upon the eighteen years reign of the Bo'sheviks it can be seen that the last part of the above paragraph has long ago become a ghastly reality.—M. G.

If we are to be saved by talk (and the talk of the few) as opposed to the experience of the whole mass of mankind, then it would seem that the human pyramid has been built upon its apex and not upon its base. And all appeals to the apex to come to the relief of the pyramid when the storms shake it are not only destined to disappointment, but they tend to obscure the real foundations of our confidence in the future.

What "liberals" and "intellectuals" and "nice folks" and all other "specially favored people" need is to realize not their consequence but their own inconsequence as compared with the momentum of the masses. Back of all special appeals by "sympathizers" there is a certain patronage of the masses which is as dangerous to the largest hopefulness as it is untrue to the deepest understanding of life itself.

The world's greatest need today is a repudiation of the whole doctrine of leadership. Faith in a free society based on cooperation of all is of far greater consequence than faith in the divineness of any one of us or any group of us in a particular way, and faith in the "divineness" of us all means the persuasion that the processes which concern us all and involve us all are of greater importance to every one of us than are the special processes of any special number of us to humanity as a whole.

What has been mistakenly called the materialistic conception of history is really the highest faith in something beyond matter, the "increased purpose" which cannot be expressed in less than the total life of the universe, and which does not admit even a "god" in any exclusively superior sense.

All the talk of "democracy" is as superficial as the war appeals which have become a mockery now, unless we mean by democracy something vastly larger than the leading of the many into the ways of the wisdom and rightness by the superior virtue and acumen of the few; unless we mean indeed, that the totality of life is more to be trusted than any fraction of it, and that salvation of any of us can only come eventually through the mass-action of the many.

The only leadership needed is the leadership of those who have lost all conceit of country, property, and social and intellectual superiority.

HIPPOLYTE HAVEL

# THE INDIVIDUAL AND DICTATORSHIP

Emile Armand

We know, that the State can perpetrate everything it wants to, because it has behind itself the armed force. The Soviet-state doesn't in the least differentiate itself in this respect from the Fascist one, or from any other powerful dictatorial State. The differentiation lies only in the interests that they represent. Any kind of a forceful-dictatorship, any sort of a stringent build-up State can, when it wants to, attain the same results as the fascism and bolshevism. It only needs to have sufficient power in its hands and create an appropriate atmosphere, in order to be enabled to suppress oppositional interests and strangle the protests of those who disagree with it.

In the development-history of the human beings since the world-war there has taken place a great change, a complete upturn. Four years, four terrible continuous years the rulers had no consideration, have not at all had any consideration with the social unity—the individual. They didn't see in the human being anything else than dead material, stockades who were not able to move themselves without "marching routes" and military orders. A few people set in a central-bureau and pushed the masses hither and thither, as it suited them best, or as it was demanded by the interests that they represented. One had to obey, without a murmur, without a thought, not asking as to the purpose. This condition has left such deep traces in the average thinking, that one must ask himself, as to whether it is not needed to divide the history in two periods; the period before and the period after the world war.

Military dictatorships, political dictatorships, financial dictatorships, social and moral dictatorships—for all this heap of sufferings and evils, that spread themselves over the world, we have to thank the war. In Russia, for instance, the stabilizing of production and consumption is simply being decreed, not mattering, as to whether it suits to the producer or consumer, or not. In Italy, decrees are issued that force, one to be "virtuous," and so on.

Where then remains the individual, the person, the "I", the social unity?

I know what will be answered to me on this. I know already the arguments of the Stalins, the Mussolinis and of all that kind; "The State-citizen, subordinate, the administrative-subject? Yes, What does he but want? We are doing for him, for his well being and security a great mass of things. Yes, we even make of him an atheist—or a religious person; we make, that his mind should work in the direction of communism—or of fascism (just as it has been before proscribed to belong to an existing state-religion); we make out of him a tiny wheel of the great, mechanical mass production, as well as of the state-mechanism—according to the demands of our interests. As a reciprocity for this mountain of deeds and good wills, that we do for him, we only ask a very small considerate thing, and this is; to renounce his personality and completely give himself over into our hands.

Herein lies the problem; does it pay to surrender our personality into the hands of dictators—for the "beneficial deeds" of a force-dictatorship with drums and trays and with flying flags?

If we were to be animals, herded together in a stockade, then the eating part would be the only real thing that would interest us, and it would not be so important, as to whether the trough is colored Bolshevik-red, or Fascist black (taking it for granted, that there is at all a trough), whether the food distributor carries upon his cap a soviet-star, or a fascist insignia or a swatiska, the main thing would be the eating part.

But when one doesn't consider oneself as a stockade-animal, when one doesn't place the eating above one's determined, self-acknowledged, ever developing personality and its traits, then the entire program changes.

There arise then different questions. For instance, as to whether the forced stabilizing of the production and of the consumption is as beneficial for the formation of this personality, where the production and the consumption through individual or various free, comradely unions; whether the hand-craft or a similar system is not better suited to build up the personality, than the extreme mechanization and rationalization; whether a single dwelling-place is not more suitable than a dwelling-armory; whether the shortening of the work-time doesn't depend more upon the quality of the product, or from the disposition of some superfluous things, than the surpassing of the mechanical mass production; whether no kind of education at all wouldn't be better, than such an education that has as its aim the implanting within the mind of the child a bolshevistic or fascist mysticism; whether public activities, as child-protection, the care of motherhood, etc., could not just as well be created through mutual associations of the participants (for example, union for transport, for travel, for correspondence-relationship and so on), than through the State?

It can very calmly be asserted, that as much as there have disappeared the superstitions as to the inequality among races and sexes, it was but a result of the culture-height of the individual, and there has been no need for any kind of interference of the State: that the freedom of the customs is a question of personal ethic, an expression of the personal conception and has nothing to do with the guarantee of the State.

Thus, whereas the outspoken dictatorships or the masked ones declare before the entire world, that force is the healing-method for all the evils in society, we say, that only the free-willingness can develop strong personalities.

Our ideas and our conception of life, which we represent only for ourselves, deserve just as much consideration, as the ideas and life conception of those, who prey of this pseudo-governmental justice. Certainly, it

force their ideas upon others, without their consent. We declare, that where there exists a force-reign of society, there is no free choice, and in that event, due to the education as well as to the administrative and policing organizations, the result will be a humanity, a society, an equality of slaves.

The Soviet Union could have a very simple method to receive the sympathies of the anarchists. It would have to, within its domain, give the anarchists an opportunity in an uninterfering way to experiment their ideas, that means to give them the liberty of expressing and propagandizing their views, to unite themselves and carry through their aims.

If the Soviet Union should accept this, it would

mean giving the opportunity for free competition, for free choice. But the body of authority lies in that of not allowing such an opportunity. A dictatorship does not want, that it should be chosen, that it should be compared with another regime, but it has to be accepted, whether one wants to or not, and one must not complain, nor speak out. There is no more despotic, oppressive system in the world.

There is no doubt, that the economic as well as for the political mysticism of bolshevism and fascism is marked the same fate, as the Catholic mysticism. One nice day they will, as all former imperialistic formations, go down to perdition by the overmeasure of their dictatorship.

## An International Appeal

While the repression against revolutionary elements in capitalistic countries provoke legitimate protestations, people seem to ignore the wretched lot, if not the Calvary of many authentic revolutionaries in Russia.

Before the wave of repression which is unceasingly increasing in Russia and is particularly aimed at militants whose revolutionary sincerity and self-denial are uncontested, an "International Committee against the Anti-Proletarian Repression in Russia" has been formed. This committee intends to denounce to the international revolutionary world; the odious acts of a dictatorial government which, at the harm of the October Revolution's spirit, maintains itself in power through use of the police terror. The latter far from defending a socialistic regime, serves to the contrary in preventing the legitimate proletarian exploitation of the people against the existing material distress and despotism.

Making use of an individual act of which Kirov was the victim, the Russian government violently accentuated the repression. According to official Russian communications, less than 48 hours after the death of Kirov, more than a hundred persons were shot to death; this, even before serious instructions could have been issued. We notice that this repression hardly touches the last Russian bourgeois or aristocratic representatives but reaches, above all, the element which has remained faithful to the revolution.

As for instance, among the numerous militants who have been arrested lately are many left socialists, communists of the opposition, and anarchists.

Sandomirski, formerly a militant anarchist, political prisoner under Czarism, firm upholder of bolshevik politics at the time when it still cared to represent the socialist revolution.

Novomirski, political prisoner under Czarism, bright publicist who consecrates the best part of his life to "The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia" and whose only crime consists in refusing to give up his libertarian convictions.

Askarov, political prisoner under Czarism; as the previous Comrade, he took a particularly active part in the October revolution and on various occasions learned the harshness of the governmental repression.

Vladimir Barmach, who has finished his term of exile in Siberia and should have been freed, has been arrested again and incarcerated. He leaves his Comrade wife sick and without any means of support.

Kordao Alexandrovitch, a Georgian student; was a prisoner of the Russian revolution but his libertarian convictions soon brought him under the cruel repression of the new Russian masters. With numerous anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists, Kordao was deported to the Solowietsky Islands in Siberia and kept there for ten years. When hardly liberated, he was again arrested and interned in a Siberian concentration camp where he has remained for the past three years.

A still more grievous fact dominant in the land defined as socialistic; in the land often represented as the country of the workers of the world; is that the government does not hesitate in spreading their persecutions against the foreign political refugees who had the misfortune in relying upon the right of asylum offered to them, the reaction mercilessly attacks the militants without consideration of their reproachless revolutionary past. Let us cite a few of the cases involved:

Gaggi, a militant Italian anarchist from the mining district of Val d'Arno, has been a refugee in Russia for the past thirteen years in order to escape a thirty years jail sentence imposed upon him in Fascist Italy. He has been incarcerated since last Jan. in a Russian Prison.

Galligaris, a communist of the opposition has often been sentenced in Italy for his activity and has even served more than three years of deportation in the Italian Islands. He is another refugee and is now in the G. P. U. cells.

Metrini, a former representative of communist youth in the comintern, has been sent to prison and undergone deportation for illegal activities in Italy. Now he has taken back his Calvary as a prisoner in the land where his party Comrades hold the power.

All these Comrades, even like hundreds of others, are being arrested and imprisoned without the possibility of our obtaining the least enlightenment upon their lot or upon the accusation weighing against them. They themselves are prevented from offering the least defense. Their fate rests upon the ultimate decision of the G. P. U. officials who apply penalties without recourse to witness or defense.

In considering the violence of the renewed repression, we wonder just what will become of those who for a very long time have been and still are the prey of this pseudo-governmental justice. Certainly, it

will not fail to exercise upon them cruel reprisals. What will become of Petrini, the rebel anarchist of Ancone, exiled in Astrakan? What will become of the proletarian writer, Victor Serge, deported in the snow bound steppes of Orenburg?

All of you who share our anxiety join yourselves to our action; not only to ask for the liberation of the actual victims, but also to put an end to such exactions. This can be done by demanding:

1) Abolition of administrative sentencing (which means trial without guaranty of defense.)

2) General amnesty for all imprisoned revolutionaries. Freedom for any national or foreigner to leave Russian territory.

The undersigned realize very well that the bringing about of such a campaign will cause grievous dissensions in the revolutionary circle. We are compelled to have recourse to such aggressive action. We cannot abandon our worthy Comrades from whom we are inseparable. We throw the whole responsibility upon the Russian government.

This is the reason why we ask you to contribute your effective help!

Austria: Pierre Ramus.

Belgium: Leo Campion; Gaston Derycke; Sadi de Corter; Ernestan; Hem Day; N. Lazarevitch; I. Met; Raoul Piron; Charles Plisnier; G. Ramen; Nil Zankin; L. Odekerken; H. Rerive; P. Dreze; L. Derive; P. Chatelain; Taihade; Pierre Fontaine; F. Liebears; War van Overstaeten; Marah; Vanderkammen; J. Freres; A. C. Ayguespaerse; Marcel Van Diest; C. Mattart.

France: Leo Barbedette; S. Faure; J. Mesnil; H. Zisley; E. Armand; Han Ryner; G. Pioc; R. Gerin; E. Bauche; M. Marijanne; M. Wullens; Magdeleine de Sancy; Raymond Offner; Henri Poulaille; Betty Brunswig; G. de Lacaze Duthiers; Perrisaget.

Great Britain: H. Runham Brown.

Holland: Ge Nabruik; Hud Madlener; Wim Jong; L. J. Botjr; Alb. de Jong; Han Kuysten; Bep. Max; Wim Wessels.

Spain: A. Santillan; Fred Montseny; Fred Urales.

Switzerland: L. Bertoni; Ch. Frigerio; B. de Ligt.

United States: Hippolyte Havel. International Committee against the Anti-Proletarian Repression in Russia.

Maison des Artistes, Grand Place, 19, Bruxelles.

(Translated by J. S.)

\* \* \*

### Liberate Alfonso Petrini!

Alfonso Petrini was sentenced to 20 years in prison by Mussolini's henchmen for his activity in the workers revolutionary movement in Italy.

Alfonso Petrini escaped from Italy and made his way to Russia. Petrini believed that Russia was controlled by the revolutionary workers and he could help them in their struggle against tyranny and oppression. He threw his energy with the revolutionaries for the successful establishment of a workers commonwealth.

Alfonso Petrini with many active years of participation in the revolutionary movement could not in silence see the fruits of the Russian workers' revolution for which they had fought, bled and died, shamefully taken from them by a new murderous and despotic clique.

Alfonso Petrini raised his voice in protest when the Bo'shevik Government confiscated the factories from the workers and stole the land from the peasants.

Alfonso Petrini remembered that the workers and peasants revolted and demolished a Czar with all his brutal henchmen to obtain the factories and land so that they might have peace and food.

Alfonso Petrini saw a new menace to the workers' freedom—a treacherous gangster mob—merciless exploiters and tyrants tricking and deceiving the poor workers into believing that the Bolshevik Government was "the voice of the worker."

Alfonso Petrini now lays in a Russian jail, suffering and desperately ill from tuberculosis; denied both care or treatment. This revolutionary worker languished in a medieval jail at the point of death, on false and lying charges.

Alfonso Petrini never had a trial and never was permitted to present a defense in Court.

Workers demand to know why Stalin is doing Mussolini's dirty work and acting as his jailor and murderer?

Workers demand the release of Alfonso Petrini and smash red, back and brown Fascism.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR POLITICAL PRISONERS. (Copy of a leaflet issued in New York City.)

As we go to press, the terrible news reaches us that the Bolshevik Government has handed over Alfonso Petrini into the claws of the Fascist hangmen of Italy!

\* \* \*

It is to be hoped that one self-evident truth will finally make its way into the consciousness of those radicals and liberals who are not dogmatic Communists.

This is that, just so far as they betray liberty in Russia by refusing to protest ag'inst Soviet acts of arbitrariness and violence, or even condoning or applauding them, they are betraying liberty all over the world and making more difficult the solution of present-day economic and social difficulties along lines which humane and rational people anywhere would regard as desirable.

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

# Correspondence and Discussion

## Who Needs "Overhauling?"

Dear Graham:

May be we shall still come to an agreement. I am quite convinced that you mean well. You are a man of strong convictions, and very sincere in all you are doing, and on account of that I have always respected your integrity a great deal. But I have observed on myself, that if we have strong convictions we are liable to become one-sided, and to close our eyes to further investigation. And this is what has happened to my mind with the anarchist movement.

As I see it the whole thing needs overhauling, and I intend to prove it to you.

First of all you say, that if I could show you that any anarchist theoretician had ever supported or expressed such thoughts as mine you would take my assertion that such thinkers as Kropotkin would agree with me.

To this I must remark, that you take the standpoint of the authoritarian. Secondly, that I am sure that Kropotkin as well as Tolstoy would greatly approve of my view point. My view point is merely an extension of what they have thought and said. It is based on wider experience, since the world has travelled far after their death.

I am going to show you now how sadly the anarchist mentality is befuddled at the present time, and I am going to refer you to the article by C. L. James in your last issue.

He states there that Marx is an anarchist. Nothing is farther from the truth. He is the very opposite, because in the first instance he made his system authoritative by giving it the name of scientific socialism. Secondly he introduced state monopoly—of everything. Now, a collectivist can never be an anarchist. And as a matter of fact, nobody has ever attacked the Bolsheviks more bitterly than the anarchists, and rightly so, as the Bolsheviks see in the anarchist their worst enemy.

Secondly Condorcet was by no means an anarchist. He was an individualist, belonging to the perfectionist school.

Thirdly: the worst confusion of mind consists for anarchists to accept Kropotkin and Tolstoy along with Max Stirner. For the former two believed in co-operation, while the latter was the most acute exponent of an unbridled egoistic competitive scheme of affairs, by which he succeeded in reducing his own system to absurdity.

And this is exactly the point that must be discussed. The lines between competition and co-operation must be clearly drawn. We cannot be co-operators if we wish to compete, and we cannot compete, if we wish to co-operate, these two are mutually exclusive. And the anarchist movement has to be brought to an acknowledgement of this fact, and it must take its stand with regard to it. This is the issue I wish to force, if I can. The discussion of this most vital problem upon which everything else hinges will bring clarity into the ranks of the anarchist movement, and it will greatly further our thoughts on the social problem.

Sincerely yours,

F. WERTGEN

Edit. Note: It is inconceivable how any anarchist can come to an agreement with such contradictory thoughts as our Friend Werten expounds above. He is only correct about Marx, and possibly also about Condorcet. But the blame rests more with the editor than with C. L. James. James wrote the article we reprinted in 1890—when Marx was confusedly still referred to by anarchists, as an anarchist. The data on James's death was then at hand, (He was born at Baden—Baden October 23, 1846, and died at Eau Claire, Wis., on June 3, 1911,) thus we made the double error of not saying anything as to when that, otherwise able, exposition of anarchism has been written. The manner in which Werten misunderstands Max Stirner is no surprise in view of the general nature of the thoughts expressed by Werten. Perhaps they need "overhauling" much worse than the anarchist theory.

\* \* \*

## Two Poets Dissent

My dear Marcus Graham:

In regard to collaboration with Hearst, I most assuredly would not agree to sell to the New York *American*, as they are one of my best markets for poetry. I have sold them much nature stuff and enjoy both the checks and the wide circulation, although I never read the American myself. I would be happy to return SEA TRAFFIC but the other poem is now too old for publication.

With every good wish,

HARRY ELMORE HURD.

It is regrettable to find the above poet more interested in enjoying the "checks" of Mr. Hearst in realizing the harm that his collaboration does in a fascist press. His collaboration in MAN! is most unwelcome.—Editor. \*

\* \* \*

Dear Mr. Graham:

I thoroughly appreciate your editorial integrity and I can understand why you would not run the poem but it does seem that in fairness to the author, after you kept the poem out of print for so long you ought to print it. I am not certain what made you classify me with collaborators in the Hearst press unless it was the simple little child's poem I sold to the N. Y. *American* some months ago. I fail to see how that lines me up with the chauvinistic Mr. Hearst. It is likely the only poem I'll ever have with them and it was merely an attempt at grabbing a few nickles from a poem I had written to my niece. A further explanation: You can't accuse the beggars of supporting capitalism or governments when they search desperately for the bread that is cast to the dumps. I wonder some time if editors and others who direct the thought of people, and in this case, toward some radical governmental and economic changes can appreciate the necessity there is for even writers to eat. I am unable to make any money—in this lovely, glorious land of ours—and I haven't found a job the last two years—in this prosperous God-fearing America—and yet when I grab two dollars and a half from Mr. Hearst I'm accused of something or other. I wonder how you expect us to live. We can't all edit MAN! nor can any groups support us even if it might be dangerous support. None of the radical publications pay us—they ask for money for the most part—and if we can't lay concrete, or drive trucks, or rivet steel—for some capitalist what can we do to live on? Though not associated with any group I am likely as much of an anarchist as any one of your supporters and because I am that way I'm without work, without money, and turned to Mr. Hearst for a hand-out, and am now criticized for it. You have made a mountain of a mole-hill and I did not intend to increase the size of it. You can return the poem if you want to. Now that the weather is warming up I'm leaving the capitalist home—belonging to my eighty-year-old mother—and going out again to try my luck. I'll probab'y be in any place at any time this Summer so you won't need to send the free copy or your magazine.

Sincerely,  
RAYMOND KRESENSKY

One can indeed appreciate the sincerity of Raymond Kresensky when compared with that of Hurd which precedes it. Radical publications are ever crying for aid, not out of pleasure or over-abundance in funds, but because they do not sell their conscience to the advertisers and the present system as a whole, as Mr. Hearst does. The fact that not all the poets or writers can be the editors of radical publications does not justify them in selling their conscience to a fascist press. There are all the difference in the world between working as a riveter and writing for a fascist organ. Surely, Raymond Kresensky can realize that, since he has no intention of further collaborating in Hearst's fascist organs, his collaboration in MAN! is doubly welcome, and his long mislaid, but excellent poem, will be found on the *Art and Literature* page of this issue.—Editor.

## The Rough Road To Utopia

I desire to thank you sincerely for the copies of MAN!, I have had from you gratiously thus far.

In the main I enjoy your paper while I do not see eye to eye with many of the thoughts expressed. Perhaps I am more to be pitied than blamed because of this. For the life of me I cannot conceive Society behaving orderly without regulation, and regulation means authority. There are many epochs through the rough road to Utopia. We are at the parting of the ways with one at the present moment. I am greatly concerned that the next shall be a step in the right direction.

Regret I have not been able to contribute towards the maintenance of the paper. Being a Budgeted relief case will help you understand this. However, I enclose 25 cents in stamps as this will help a little, and will do better when I am able. Shall be glad to receive MAN! if you feel disposed to send it. WILLIAM LATHAM

Exchange Medium A Cure For All Evils

Comrade Graham:

You entirely ignore the CAUSE and devote your entire time to a discussion of effects.

You entirely loose sight of the fact that LABOR creates ALL wealth, and they only loose it when they accept the other fellow's money for it. You may not believe in violence, however you are continually getting into trouble for it, and are continually asking for funds to fight it. Now it is self evident that if they did not surrender the wealth they create to the other fellow they would not have to ask him for a little of the money that he took from them to fight him with.

His ability to oppress is entirely dependent on our stupidness in surrendering any part of what we produce to him for something we do not need. Don't do a foolish thing and then go around whining about the results. If you are going to create ALL might just as well KEEP ALL and have ALL in your own hands to do with as you please.

The fat boy can not either help or hinder when you

get sense enough to create your OWN medium of exchange. Don't even need changes in the already existing laws, just simply create your OWN medium of exchange, do your own business and never even mention the fat boys, they are the ones that will get hungry when we quit feeding them.

Now if you know more about this subject than I do I certainly want to hear it as knowledge is one of desired objects.

The way is always open if we look in the right place. In this case a PERSONAL money available at all times to all who render valuable service.

Most sincerely,

H. H. CUMMINS

*It is regrettable to find that our critical friend reads our pages so carelessly. If there is any social movement that goes after fundamentals—it is the anarchist one. That is the chief cause why all governments, liberal, socialist and communist alike, fight us just as much as the most reactionary ones.*

*Our friend Cummins believes that his pet exchange theory can prove as the Cure of all evils, when as a matter of fact, it's but another patch-up method that does not deal with the real fundamental issues that are centered within the exploiter as such, and their legalized protectors, the government. As long as either of the two remain alive, true economic and political freedom, will remain an impossibility.—Editor.*

\* \* \*

*Let those who, with more honesty than prudence, following the footsteps of Danton, revive today the proposition for direct government; who, again, like Danton, remind the people of their imprescriptible rights and cry: No more dictators! No more doctrinaires! let them not forget that the Dictatorship is at the end of their theory . . . To be governed is to be watched, inspected, spied, directed, law-ridden, regulated, penned up, indoctrinated, preached at checked, appraised, sized, censured, commanded by beings who have neither knowledge nor virtue.*

P. J. PROUDHON

## HEALTH AND THE DOCTOR

The eminent Dr. P. L. Clark of Chicago says:

"The treatment (of disease) advocated by most medical authorities shows an utter lack of the slightest knowledge as to the cause and cure of disease. For instance, cold sponging is recommended by many authorities to control the fever (in measles). If you want to kill a child having measles, use cold water."

The famous Dr. J. H. Tilden of Denver, observes:

"For 25 years I practiced the science of medicine. During the most of that time I did not know why people were sick, why they got well, nor why they died. Not one of the best practitioners can tell, after the first 24 hours of medication, whether the symptoms presenting themselves are those of the disease, or are due to drug. No doctor, from the professor in college down to those in the rear ranks, knows anything definite about his patients after the first day's drugging."

The prominent Dr. W. A. Evans, one of the principal medical propagandists in the newspapers, once wrote in his disease column articles:

"Frankly, we cannot even cure a common cold."

He is right! Here is one M. D. telling the naked truth. Drugs and doctors can cure nothing.

Food is the foundation of all human health. As to the science of food, most medical doctors are as ignorant as a child. Dr. Elmer Lee of New York says:

"When it comes to foods, they (drug doctors) are helpless. The grocer or the baker or the candy maker is as fit to prescribe a diet for a . . . patient, as is the average allopathic doctor."

Dr. Lee is a medical doctor of 50 years active experience in the practice of medicine. On the same point another prominent New York M. D. remarks:

"With all my knowledge of bacteriology, pathology, material medicine and surgery, of pills, powders and potions, of chemicals and drugs, I was utterly and completely ignorant of the scientific principles of health. I was ignorant of diet. I knew not the first physical culture exercise to recommend. I was totally ignorant of the subject of ventilation, drainage and plumbing."

"Of the essential fundamentals of health, I knew nothing whatsoever. All my life I had been seeking specific agents and reagents with which to assist the system in battle with disease poisons. But nowhere at any time had I given an hour's thought to the constructive principles."

Medical doctors study drugs and disease, not the science of health and life. They may study drugs and disease till time shall cease to be, and still be as ignorant of the science of health as in the beginning, for Nature does not build health and life from drugs and disease.

Experience conclusively proves these assertions to be true, for drug doctors, as a rule, are sick as often and suffer as much from the same disease, as their most stupid and superstitious patients.

Now do they live longer than other men. The great German scientist, Dr. Ehrlich, died of indigestion, helpless to help himself. The renowned French scientist, Dr. Louis Pasteur, who gave the world "pasteurization" to keep people well, was himself an invalid the last 14 years of his life. Since such physicians as Ehrlich, Pasteur, Metchnikoff, and many other brilliant lights of Medical Science could not help themselves, how can they help others?

If an assassin gives a person a poisonous drug and he dies, it is because the poison killed him. If a medical doctor gives a patient the same drug poison and he dies, it is because the poison could not save his life. This system should be called legalized murder. What else is it? Oh, Medical Science, thou art false to the core! In the words of the famous Dr. Norman Barnesby:

"Too many lives have already been sacrificed upon the altar of medical pretension and sham, and what one man could estimate or depict the awful harvest of suffering and blood, that we as a Nation are reaping from our criminal apathy in allowing an organization of men, as fallible as those of any other profession, to acquire an irresponsible power of life and death over millions of helpless human beings?"

The witches our forefathers feared, have lost their terror; the saints and demigods that history worshipped, we have cast into oblivion; but the infernal demon which rages within the body, and which the priests and elders have for ages sought to drive out with poison, is still with us. He ravishes our bodies now, with torment and torture, as he did in the dark past, and our modern priests and elders still try to drive him out with the same old dope, which has by cul-

ture been somewhat modernized into vaccines, serums, antitoxins, etc.

We should not forget that doctors are only human; nor must we expect that in their faith and belief they are competent or capable of rising above the influence of their teaching and environment. While the fallacy that drug poisons can cure disease had its origin in the dark and superstitious minds of the ignorant ancients, this stupid belief has been instilled so long and so consistently into the minds of the people and medical science, that to the Disciples of Drugs and all their adherents, it is a positive reality. Should this seem strange? No. If we are thoroughly and continually taught any theory, it becomes our fixed belief, no matter how false or factual it may actually be.

(Health Culture)

Dr. G. R. CLEMENTS

## For Your Library

ALDRED, GUY—Socialism and Parliament	25
ALLEN, GRANT—The Evolution and Idea of God	30
BAILY, WILLIAM—Josiah Warren: The First American Anarchist	175
BAKUNIN, MICHAEL—God and the State	\$50
BARRETT, GEORGE—The Anarchist Revolution	05
BERKMAN, ALEXANDER—What Is Communist Anarchism?	75
BURKE, EDMUND—A Vindication of Natural Society	20
BURY, J. B.—A History of Freedom of Thought	85
CARPENTER, EDWARD—Love, Coming of Age	75
DE CLEYRE, VOLTAIRINE—Anarchism and American Tradition	10
FERM, ALEXIS C.—Problem of Education	10
FOR LIBERTY: An Anthology of Revolt	15
GODWIN, WILLIAM—Reflections on Political Justice	10
An Inquiry Concerning Political Justice, in two volumes	300
GRAHAM, MARCUS—An Anthology of Revolutionary Poetry	100
GROSSER, PHILIP—Uncle Sam's Devil's Island	15
HAVEL, HIPPOLYTE—What's Anarchism?	10
KROPOTKIN, PETER—Anarchist Communism	10
Revolutionary Government	05
An Appeal to the Young	10
The Wage System	05
Law and Authority	10
Conquest of Bread	100
Fields, Factories and Workshops	100
Great French Revolution (2 vols)	150
Revolutionary Pamphlets (Bound)	75
Memoirs of a Revolutionist	100
The Place of Anarchism in Socialist Evolution	10
LABADIE, JOSEPH T.—Anarchism and Other Essays	15
LETTERS—Sacco and Vanzetti	150
MALATESTA, ERICO—Anarchy	10
A Talk Between Two Workers	10
MILL, J. S.—On Liberty	40
MORRIS, WILLIAM—News from Nowhere	60
OPPENHEIMER, FRANZ—The State: Its History and Development	10
OWEN, WILLIAM C.—Anarchism versus Socialism	10
PAIN, THOMAS—The Rights of Man	50
PROUDHON, P. J.—The Solution of the Social Problem. General Idea of the Revolution of the Nineteenth Century (Paper 25) bound	40
What Is Property?	140
RAMUS, PIERRE—Why Does Anarchism Progress So Slowly?	05
READ, WINWOOD—The Martyrdom of Man	85
ROE, GEORGE—Individual Socialism	05
REMEMBER—The Eleventh of November	05
RECLUS, ELISEE—Evolution and Revolution	10
SPENCER, HERBERT—Man Versus the State	40
Education	40
STIRNER, MAX—The Ego and His Own	175
THOREAU, HENRY D.—Walden	100
TUCKER, BENJ.—Individual Liberty	75
State Socialism and Anarchism	10
Why I Am An Anarchist	10
Add five cents additional for postage on pamphlets and 15 on all books.	

\* \* \*

*The State, however popular may be the form it assumes, will always be an institution of domination and exploitation, and control of the masses and giving the initiative to the scions of the populace. There is no other way, then, of emancipating the people economically and politically, of giving them liberty and well-being at one and the same time, that by abolishing the State, all States, and, by so doing, killing, once and for all time, what, up to now, has been called "Politics," i.e., precisely nothing else than the functioning or manifestation both internal and external of State action, that is to say, the practice, or art and science of dominating and exploiting the masses in favour of the privileged classes.*

MICHAEL BAKUNIN.

## Why Does Anarchism Progress So Slowly?

By PIERRE RAMUS

This remarkable essay has just been published in pamphlet form

FIVE CENTS PER COPY

Twenty or More 3 Cents per Copy

# ART AND LITERATURE

## On and On

I.

On and on  
Yon river flows  
Angels as the Sun,  
On and on,  
Yon river flows  
Yet meets the sea at length

II.

On and on,  
The blood of Man  
Oozes drop by drop,  
On and on,  
The blood of Man  
Must drown the few betimes.

III.

On and on,  
Oh man of Man  
Bow not down to self,  
On and on,  
Oh man of Man  
Defile the alters of your desolation!

LISA LUCHKOVSKY

## Courses

(de MUSSET—IL EST DEUX ROUTES)

Two ways avail to take through life;  
The one apart from human strife,  
With ferns and grass and flowers rife,  
A gentle flowing stream.  
Across a wide and fertile plain  
It passes by distress and pain  
With naught to give and naught to gain—  
A still unbroken dream.  
The other is a mountain flood,  
A torrent bearing stones and mud  
Encarnadined with human blood  
To bury in the sea.  
The one will flow the other drive,  
The one will rest, the other strive—  
For one is dead and one alive;  
And which shall ours be?

## Dungeon of Tasso

(LAMARTINE—QUE L'ON SOIT HOMME)

God or man, the martyr's fate  
Waits for those whose lives are free;  
Afterwards we dedicate  
Altars to their memory.

Still the great among the small  
Die the death—to live behind  
Gallows where the people fall  
Worshipping the once maligned.

Shall we timidly recoil  
Lest we suffer in their place?  
Never! Tears and blood are oil  
For the lamps that light the race.

English version by BUHL EDMOND

## The Madonna of the Cattle Cars

An air of graciousness  
Subdues the stronger one—  
Curiosity!  
With an air of culture  
She oversees their living quarters,  
Brings them food—leaves thrown to the dogs—  
Small gifts of handkerchiefs and such,  
Perhaps a rosary, prayer book;  
Every sin has its book and bell.  
Pseudo-interest in their welfare—  
She could not bear to think  
Of them unclean, unsatisfied for food  
And drink.  
Oh, no. Her mind could not rest  
If their beds were not smooth,  
Their faces smooth, their thoughts smooth.  
Dream lovers, even real ones,  
Must be clean, cool, and well-fed.  
And a Madonna, most of all,  
Should be clean and attractive without  
If not within.

JAMES NEILL NORTHE

## Men Without Gods

Do men labor to feed their souls—if they have souls, and if they labor?  
Do men labor to wrest, for others, an existence from the bowels of the earth to feed souls, if there are souls, and if there is food?  
How absurd they seem, gesturing in the face of gods who like themselves are broken by the light of day!  
No, men labor to feed the bellies of others, that those others might boast of souls to those that labor and are not credited with such.

One man spends the richest part of his life digging in the dark of an underground tunnel, merely to keep the temperature of houses around seventy degrees.  
Another sweats and toils all day long to add a polished gleam of the embellishments on autos.  
One breaks his back, puts a hump where his shoulders could be straight and firm, bending over a machine, that ladies may wear soft, pink underwear, and others who are not ladies may do the same.

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, 2 Vol. by William Henry Chamberlin. Macmillan Co.

"A powerful strain of peasant anarchism runs through the whole course of the Russian Revolution." Chamberlin's book is really a description of "Russia's Iron Age," and tells in detail of the tyranny of present day Russia, and gives a clear and fairly unbiased account of the Revolution up to 1921 and the New Economic Policy. He entered Russia as a left wing Socialist and after 12 years of residence, he and his Russian wife and son finally left Russia sorrowfully admitting that the Bolsheviks had sold out the idea of a real revolution for the power and tyranny which they now possess. The quotation at the beginning of this paragraph is only one of many which might be given in a chapter devoted to Anarchism. Through the book the author is sympathetic to the ideals of anarchism.

He quotes Lenin as saying, "While there is a state there is no freedom. When there is freedom there will be no state." He tells of Lenin's opposition to Trotsky's idea of war communism when Lenin stated: "The trade-unions must defend the workers against the state bureaucracy." He points out that it was far easier to criticize Lenin than Stalin and remain alive, and quotes a common saying in Russia today: "Every Soviet citizen is, has been or will be in prison."

Chamberlin gives more credit to Trotsky in building up the Red Army than orthodox Bolshevik historians will grant, but shows that if Trotsky and his despotism had prevailed there would be a worse, if possible, military despotism than there is today. He quotes an official Bolshevik historian as admitting when speaking of war communism: "Such a decline in the productive forces not of a little community, but of an enormous society of a hundred million people . . . is unprecedented in the history of humanity."

His chapter dealing with our comrade Nestor Makhno tells in detail of the cooperation of Makhno with the Bolsheviks in driving out the Whites; and his battle against the food commissars who robbed the peasants. His activities are summarized: "He had fought on two fronts, against Reds and Whites alike, in the name of what he and the peasants who followed him believed was freedom . . . He saw in the landlords and "gold-epaulets" the standard bearers of an old servitude; in the Communists commissars and food collectors the heralds of a new slavery for the peasants." A long paragraph from a manifesto by Makhno defining the anarchist plan of society is given in volume two. Berkman and Goldman are quoted many times.

In telling of the first outbreak of the revolution Chamberlin says: "The outstanding feature of the post-Revolutionary Russian army was the far-flung network of committees which sprang up everywhere like mushrooms: company committees, regimental committees, army committees, front committees, the peasants in township committees, land committees, peasant Soviets."

The author believes that the Revolution would have broken down if Lenin had not formulated the New Economic Policy when he did. He shows that the force which compelled Lenin to act was the rebellion of the Anarchist dominated sailors of Kronstadt against the terrible tyranny of war communism which was reducing the productivity of the country and discouraging even many of the old time revolutionists. The two books are well worth reading. Complete references are given for facts quoted. The author having read hundreds of books and documents in Russian. He quotes also a "History of the Makhno Movement" by Arshinov, published in Germany.

AMMON A. HENNACY

\*\*\*

ESCAPE FROM THE SOVIETS by Tatiana Tchernavin. E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc. New York

Tatiana Tchernavin served as a senior assistant of the Curator of the Hermitage, once considered one of the best museums in Europe. Fifteen out of the 23 years she served under the Bolshevik government. The book deals chiefly with her own experiences and reactions, as one of the educated classes, toward the assumingly "proletarian dictatorship." Her bitter contempt for the people with whom she came in contact as superiors, and afterwards as her persecuting tormentors, lessens the horrible indictment she has recorded in the book, but by no means nullifies it.

She writes:

The more sentences of death and of penal servitude were passed the more indifferent every one became. It was no longer a case of individual people perishing, a whole class was being wiped out... Suicide is a selfish action, but it may be even indication of the general state of things; when there is nothing to live for and no strength to carry on, there is nothing left but death . . . Pirogov in his article about the Decembrists, says that we must not blame

Do they love the complicated machines?  
They feed their lives, their life-blood, to them to keep them going.

Let's boil things down, and get to fundamentals.  
No man's soul would tell him to dig for coal, or polish metal, or make cloth, to feed his soul—if he has a soul, and if he has food.  
Are these men blind, possessed by gods that are no gods at all?  
Let them bring their gods to the light, and let them come to the light.  
If both are broken—no matter. The man can still face the light.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY

Pestel for his penitent letter to Nicholas I because he had five months of solitary confinement . . . the Socialist Government of the "freest country in the world" condemned women whose guilts had not yet been established by the OGPU, to an existence that was little better than a living death. If Pestel lost courage, what was to be expected of these women? Some went mad, others committed suicide, but the rest remained true to themselves and went into exile with the same fortitude . . . Twentieth century Socialism, and so much hatred!"

In one part of the book Madame Tchernavin makes her son ask;

"Why do they shoot people now?"

And to this should have been added: Why do they persecute, jail, exile and deport any one? Why is there no freedom of thought, of expression, of the press? Why is the whole life controlled, colored, regulated, influenced and decreed by a singular minor clique out of a population of over 160 million?

Even if Madame Tchernavin would not speak as she partly does, of the persecutions of revolutionists and lack of freedom in general, her pen-picture of the educated class' torments, persecution, exile and annihilation—would still remain the most stinging indictment that has so far been made against the wanton, shameless and indefensible misdeeds being committed in the name of the Revolution by the Bolshevik Government. As I say somewhere else in this issue: if a successful social revolution has to resort to the persecution of any of its opponents, be they well-intentioned or not, then the Social Revolution forfeits to be considered any longer as an upheaval that had as its objects the dawn of justice and freedom. It becomes, in turn, the very same sort of institution of fear and despotism that it has replaced. And sooner or later—it will meet the same fate as every reign by force and oppression has met in the history of man.

Wherever the Bolshevik regime could have befriended its vanquished enemies and opponents it has instead imbued them with such contempt and hatred that only a new social revolution against its reign will be able to wipe out and to rectify. This holds true as much to a Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, the anarchists, the social revolutionists, the social democrats, the educated class, or even to the rank outspoken enemies of the revolution.

But after all—perhaps Madame Tchernavin is wrong in having expected a "Socialistic Government" to act any different than it has been acting. A more thorough study of Karl Marx's ideas of his life activity, followed so diligently by his disciples, will reveal to her that bigotry, slander, misrepresentation and double-dealings were some of Marx's chief traits—when not at the helm of any Government. What he might have done in such a position can best be surmised by what his staunchest self-proclaimed followers are now doing in Russia.

Bankrupt and exposed as an enemy of Liberty and Justice stands now before the world—Socialism in practice—as in Russia. The crimes described by Madame Tchernavin are but the practical factual added proof and attestation of this truth.

MARCUS GRAHAM

## THE CRIMINAL

Jim was hungry. Also, he was cold. Overhead, gray clouds, menacing and forboding, hung low as the wind with sleet for daggers struck the vagabond in the face.

Jim walked the streets, a lonely, forlorn piece of humanity spewed up from the depths of a great city. He had been in the big house for five years . . . sent up from North Fort Worth for kicking a crib in a suburban bank. The banker who stole by using an adding machine and a bottle of ink to juggle figures, being a deacon in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, SOUTH, testified against Jim. There could be no further evidence needed. The banker, robber he was with pen and pencil, was beyond the reach of the law. Anyway, Jim was back and he was hungry.

Before him in the window was a loaf of bread. In an adjoining window was an overcoat. Hunger with the sharp teeth of a rodent gnawed at his vitals. Jim also was cold, as dagger-pointed sleet struck him in the face.

"I'm going straight this time," Jim said to himself. "I'll never rob again . . . even if I starve I'm goin' straight . . ."

"Hey, what youah doing there?" a harnass bull growled as he came up from behind. "Why it's ol' Jim Gowins . . . burglar . . . what the hell you doin' back in town . . . ? come on, let's get goin' . . . it's the stir fer you every time you get on my beat."

Down at headquarters the dicks began a barrage of questions. Jim for a while was silent. Then he blew up . . . cussed out the cops as usual. They laughed and pitched Jim back in the stir to cool off. Jim was "held on suspicion." For a week he stayed in jail, then the dicks came around and told him to get out of town and stay out. They called it giving him "hours."

"If we see you in town again after twenty four hours we gonna sock you in jail again," one of the detectives said. "We are givin' you "hours . . . " get going and keep goin'. You are an ex-con and we don't want any of you fellers stickin' around here."

That night Jim, face drawn and square jawed blew a safe in North Fort Worth. A cop was on the job and nabbed Jim . . .

"Life," the jury said a few days later.

"An habitual criminal," the social worker said. "We did all we could," a copper brayed like a jackass, "we tried to get him out of town."

WILLIAM ALLEN WARD

# The Law of Political Rule and Economic Exploitation

As is the case with most of my fellow Americans I have heard a great deal about Senator Huey Pierce Long, former Governor and unofficial dictator of Louisiana. But I really know very little about him, his policies, his aims, beyond what has been generally published by our standard press.

Nevertheless I know something about some of his fiercest opponents at large, and as I deem these utterly incapable of espousing a good or even tolerably decent cause, I have often suspected that Senator Long—though unscrupulous politician enough to reach the U. S. Senate and be able to aim at a higher seat in governmental hierarchy—he must have been more than a shade better and less enslaved to the vested interests, than his political enemies. Otherwise I am sure they would not have been so unrelentless in their hatred which expressed itself for years in blatant denunciations, scurrilous sarcasms and vilifying innuendos.

When I think that neither Mr. W. R. Hearst—the lowest of journalists—nor Mr. Mitchell Palmer—the shadiest of politicians—nor any of the high priests or priestesses of reaction, have experienced anything nearly so ruthless at the hands of the respectable press, I am tempted to class the late Senator Long with Upton Sinclair, for instance, and conclude that he was vilified and opposed not for his vices—which he had in common with his enemies—but for his policies as a self-styled reformer.

His death, at the hands of one Dr. Carl Weiss Jr., member of his opposition in Louisiana, has not placated Senator Long's many and powerful enemies' animosity.

The most cautious ones, individuals or newspapers, to be sure, decry the recourse to violence in political competitions. But it is evident that only his personal and political friends are really sorry about the Senator's assassination.

As a matter of fact, less than twenty-four hours after his death, Senator Long's assassination is mostly spoken of euphemistically as his "removal" from the scene of politics, or from the political campaign of 1936.

Even the more reserved interpreters of "public opinion" do not hide the fact that they feel relieved by Senator Long's "removal."

As for the more outspoken ones, I think it worth while to transcribe some of their statements.

Said editorially the *Daily News* (New York City, Sept. 10, 1935):

The shooting of Senator Huey Long (Dem., La.) reminds you of the old saying that the last weapon available to victims of tyranny is assassination of the tyrant.

Political assassinations are not morally justifiable, but they are tried and sometimes they succeed. We have had a number of them in this country—the murders of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley, the attempted assassinations of Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt, (the latter resulting in the death of Mayor Anton Cermak of Chicago), the assassination of Mayor Gaynor of New York and Goebel of Kentucky.

Most of these were the work of men driven crazy by jaded wranglers. The Long attack apparently was caused by Long's autocracy—he made himself dictator of Louisiana—and was perpetrated by a sane man seemingly because his father-in-law was about to be steam-rollered out of his job as a district judge by the Long machine.

These things happen sometimes to men who seize the limelight and insist on holding all the power in sight in their own hands. The limelight and autocratic power seem to generate a killing fury in the brains of some people who are not able to keep their emotions under control.

And again, in another issue:

Long turned the State of Louisiana into a dictatorship; a government of thugs, by thugs and for thugs, with himself as No. 1 thug. Under Long's rule, only votes in favor of the Long machine's candidates or policies counted. Anti-Long votes carried no weight. And thus it invited some excitable opponent of his to snatch up and use the last weapon available against tyrants—assassination.

Various editorial thinkers are telling us bumblingly that political assassination never changes or settles a situation or does any good, just as pacifists say war is futile and decides nothing.

It seems to us that the Archduke's assassination at Sarajevo in 1914 and the war which followed it changed about everything in the world. Ask ex-Kaiser Wilhelm.

It is too bad all this could not have been accomplished by ballots instead of bullets. But Long had with full intent of the will made the ballot a joke in Louisiana. He paid the price.

The *Daily Eagle* (Ind.) Brooklyn, N. Y.

While the nation is shocked by the killing of Senator Huey P. Long, it must be admitted that the Louisiana tragedy reached a logical and not unexpected climax in this political assassination. Even Senator Long had foreseen such an ending of the extraordinary travesty on democratic government in which he had played the principal role. Lamentable as it seems to say it, he was the victim of violence he himself had engendered.

The *Jersey Journal* (Ind. Rep.) Jersey City, N. J.:

The manner of his removal will be the centre of much debate—whether it was an act of lawless murder or of desperate patriotism—but there can be no question that the country is better off without Huey P. Long.

The killing of Senator Long has, however, settled nothing. In the eyes of Kingfish worshipers it has made a martyr of him, but by itself the killing has done nothing to advance the cause of good government as opposed to the ruthless dictatorship which Long had set up in his home State.

From outside Louisiana the appearance may be that a mere murder was committed for personal vengeance. But many in Louisiana consider that Dr. Carl A. Weiss Jr. committed no ordinary murder, but sacrificed his life in an attempt to stop the progress toward absolute dictatorship and abolition of American rights.

## JUST PUBLISHED

### Mussolini Red and Black

by

ARMANDO BORGHI

The most thorough-going exposure of Mussolini in the English Language

Book-Bound, 189 Pages—\$1.50—Obtainable Through MAN!

*The Evening News*, Newark, N. J.:

The Bible, which Huey Long forever quoted with more reverence, says that those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword. That should be the Louisianian's epitaph. By demagoguery and intimidation he made himself tyrant of his native State. Louisiana was a feudal barony. Those who followed Long were rewarded; those who opposed him were in process of losing their citizenship to all practical purpose. His last efforts were to bring the judiciary under his thumb.

Murder can never be condoned, perhaps, and political murder is the very antithesis of government. It is anarchy, but anarchy is the child of despotism. Arrogant Huey Long, loudly derisive and contemptuous of those who opposed him, swaggering about with an armed guard, invited assassination as surely as a drunken driver, speeding through orderly traffic, invites a violent end.

*The Times* (Ind. Dem.) Chattanooga, Tenn.:

The use of assassination to rid the political scene of a leader who may be feared or hated is not an American habit. Few will fail to deplore the act of an overwrought young man who was willing to lose his own life if by his death he could destroy what he regarded as the malevolent power of his victim.

And few will fail to realize that by his own violent methods Huey P. Long aroused a spirit of violence in others. Deplorable as it is that he should have met a death so tragic, it was an end which he could have expected and which he certainly feared.

The assassin, slain by members of his victim's aroused camp, committed a deed which represented the full-flowering of the violence and ruthlessness that have marked the progress of Senator Long in politics. Huey Long sowed the wind and he reaped the whirlwind.

*The News* (Ind. Dem.) Dallas, Tex.:

The dead Senator was capable of stirring intense enthusiasm in support outside of his political machine, and has deep-rooted animosity in Americans not his political foes but clear viewers of political wrong. For another quarter of a century it may be impossible to obtain an unbiased view of the man who emerged from nowhere to challenge public attention and create a national problem. Rhetorical Anthony at his fine funeral will not say that they come to bury Caesar, not to praise him. Yet the fact cannot be avoided that that is the way a large part of oppressed Louisiana feels.

*The Oregonian* (Ind.) Portland, Ore.:

Long's Louisiana empire is already in process of dissolution a few hours after his death, and such strengthening of nation-wide radical opinion as results from the assassination will be inherited by other Leftists leaders—by Father Coughlin, Dr. Townsend, Governor Olson and such as may appear.

Long went about like Capone, escorted by guards; he subdued the government of New Orleans by the use of bayonets; force showed behind his every act of dictatorship. That was the method he used for attaining power, and that was the method used by a citizen in bringing him low. Force breeds force.

As for individual opinions, here are a few taken from the letter column of the "Daily News" New York City, Sept. 10, 1935:

*Brooklyn*: This country evidently isn't the pushover for would-be dictators that many people have thought it was. We seem to have some vitality left in our body politic, when a plain citizen will get up on his hind legs and say it with bullets to a guy who has openly admitted his ambition to rule this country as Stalin rules Russia and Mussolini rules Italy.

*EAGLE JOE*.

*Manhattan*: To me, being a half-mystical cuss, the shots that punctured Huey Long's bellerino were the gong taps signifying the official end of the depression. The incident, to me, symbolizes the great American people rising up to throw off their backs the various crackpots have been kidding them along with idiotic schemes for bringing better times.

J. H. FAZOOZA.

*Richmond*: Huey Long would hold a Legislature session on a Sunday, would he? Well, look at what the Lord did to him for desecrating the Lord's Day.

*MEHITABEL MAHAFFY*.

*Brooklyn*: The man who shot Long was a member of our great middle class. The moral is clear. Beware, agitators and radicals of every description, of irritating the middle class beyond

## The Issue of Deportation

The case of Dominick Sallito has been transferred to New York. He surrendered in the early part of this month at Ellis Island, where he was released within a few days on a \$1,000 bond furnished by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The San Francisco bond was thereby automatically released. In view of this change, the New York Ferrero-Sallito Defense Conference is appealing for funds in order to carry on the defense, as well as a wide propaganda for the dropping of the deportation order against both men.

Their address is: 133 Second Avenue, Room 24, New York City.

\*\*\*

Colonel W. C. MacCormack, Commissioner of Immigration, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

For thirty five years I have lived here on a small chicken farm, as inoffensive (unless bad spelling is such) and harmless as millions of my fellow country men. Yet all my life I have read the publications of Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, and many others, and I have thought just what seemed to me about all these groups and their doctrines.

It does not seem to me any more dangerous to the stability of our Government for the Anarchists or Communists to denounce and attack it than for the Republicans or Democrats to denounce and attack the Administration in power.

Consequently, it seems to me that it is pretty small game for the Government to molest such harmless and inoffensive persons as Vincent Ferrero and Dominick Sallito, who are threatened with deportation, because they happen to be anarchists or have let some portion of their premises for the use of an anarchist publication.

Why is that administrations concerned with such policies as those involved in "the new freedom" and the "new deal" should condescend to such petty practices as molesting harmless foreigners or aliens? Do they lack faith in the institutions of their country, or in their own sincerity of purpose, or in the patriotic sentiments of the people?

I notice in *The Times* of June 30 that you have stated that the number of aliens who are here illegally and subject to deportation is probably less than 100,000. As I know nothing about the facts of illegal entries into this country, I have nothing to say about it.

But feeling how inoffensive my own life has been I am not in sympathy with any policy that molests persons like myself, even though aliens.

\*\*\* THOMAS J. LLOYD

Auxiliary Defence Committee:

Your communication entitled "The New Inquisition" regarding Ferrero and Sallito, got here while I was away from home, and I presume I am much too late now to do anything about it. Apparently the Democratic conscience of your republic has sunk to very low levels. Cases, such as you describe, will, no doubt, be protested universally by every enlightened person.

(Canada)

L. W. CONKLIN

endurance. If you do, they will gang up on you as sure as you're a foot high, and set up a middle class dictatorship like the Nazi dictatorship in Germany and the Fascist dictatorship in Italy.

LEON THE BOURGEOIS.

From New Orleans, La., through the services of the N. Y. World Telegram, Leo O. Lester, vice president of the "Square Deal" opposition to the Long machine:

The time has come for the people of Louisiana to act and remove themselves from the yoke of this dictatorship.

The legislators now can act without fear and trembling. Should they fail to repeat the unjust laws now upon the books, they had best heed the example of the man who has just passed away.

\*\*\*

I hold no brief for either Senator Long or his policies or his dictatorship. I believe that dictators and dictators should be resisted by all means by a free citizenship.

Neither do I argue about such age old axioms as that: "autocracy is tempered by assassination;" "the last weapon available to victims of tyranny is assassination of the tyrant;" "those who live by the sword shall perish by the sword;" "political murder... is the child of despotism;" "he who sows wind reaps whirlwind;" "force breeds force," and so on.

But then I compare the present opinion of these same editors with the far different opinions they expressed on a similar occasion, almost three years ago, when a poor unemployed laborer shot at and missed president-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt. Without exception all these newspapers expressed themselves fiercely against political assassination. None of them went out of the way to find historical extenuations, or political, failing moral, justifications for the would-be assassin. They all agreed then that worse than an assassin, the would-be murderer was to be branded as a parrot.

Why such a difference in judging identical facts? President Roosevelt, after all, had been elected also by the votes and campaigning of the late Senator Long's dictatorial machine.

Or does it make such a great difference that the would-be assassin of three years ago was an unemployed laborer and the intended victim a shrewd politician of aristocratic education, while the Baton Rouge assassin was an intellectual member of the privileged class and his victim a self made politician of radical leanings?

If that is all the difference, and it is hard to find others, then another age old axiom emerges from the leniency expressed by a vast section of our national press in its judgment of the Louisiana tragedy which "removed Senator Long from the political scene and that is: the ruling class is adamant in its reprobation of political assassination whenever it deems it contrary to its interests; the ruling class may condone or extenuate, even abet political assassination whenever it deems it favorable to its interests.

Which is not only historical truth, but also a fundamental law of political rule and economic exploitation.

Melchior Seel

\*\*\*

Every social movement is from its inception progressive, afterwards becoming reactionary. Christianity was also in its beginning a movement to aid the poor and forlorn, later on it became a means for ruling over the masses. The same has happened with communism. It came as a liberator, but it became a weapon by which to enslave the Russian people. Communism speaks only nice words, but in its practice it is—oppression... Who oppresses? Whoever has the power... The present Communists agitate against class reign, but they themselves are already becoming the ruling class. The reign, which has been introduced in Russia, is a reign of the regime over every individual being. It is worse than the past capitalism... The unions are not defending the interests of the workers. According to the idea they should be organizations, who represent labor, who defend them against the regime. In reality they are bureaucratic institutions, who are oppressing the mute masses—Dr. Moissya OLGIN in the New York Forward of May 29, 1921.

\*Dr. Olgin is now chief editor of the Communist New York Jewish Daily *Freiheit* (Freedom).

## Financial Statement

(August 15 to September 15)

INCOME .....	\$133.66
EXPENDITURES .....	112.65
DEFICIT FROM LAST ISSUE .....	42.97
	\$155.62
	133.66
DEFICIT .....	\$21.96

## RECEIVED FROM GROUPS

Crompond, N. Y., \$12.20—Detroit, Mich., \$2.50—Chicago, Ill., \$5.00—San Francisco, Calif., \$70.11—T. F. Chicago, Ill., \$1.00—Monongahela, Pa., \$5.00—Haverhill, Mass., \$2.00—Chicago, Ill., \$6.25.

\*\*\*

## Pamphlet Fund

Book Department of MAN! ..... \$10.00  
Contributions from Picnic in California ..... 42.00  
TOTAL ..... \$52.00

## MAN!

*A Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement*

EDITOR, MARCUS GRAHAM

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: \$1.00 PER YEAR

Sample Copies Free Upon Request

MAN! invites the collaboration of all workers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, prose, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscript is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address

MAN!

P. O. Box 115, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.